OF

Saving Faith:

That it is not only gradually, but ſpecifically diſtinct from all Common FAITH.

The Agreement of *Richard Baxter* with that very Learned conſenting Adverſary, that hath maintained my Aſſertion by a pretended Confutation in the end of *Serjeant Shephards* Book of *Sincerity* and *Hypocriſie*.

With the Reaſons of my Diſſent in ſome paſſages that came in on the by.

Together with his Addition to the ſeventh Impreſſion of the *Saints Everlaſting REST.*

by R. Baxter

Dr. *Preſton Golden Scepter*, *pag.* 210. [*Object.* It ſeems then that the Knowledge of a carnal man and a regenerate man differ but in Degrees, not in Kind.] *Anſw.* The want of Degrees here alters the kind; as in Numbers the Addition of a Degree alters the Species.

Read this point practically improved in Mr. *Pinks* excellent Sermons of *Sincere Love to Chriſt*, on *Luke* 14. 26. *pag.* 1. and *pag.* 33. *&c.*

LONDON, Printed by *R. W.* for *Nevil Simmons*, Bookſeller in *Kederminſter*, and are to be ſold by *John Starkey* at the *Miter* at the Weſt end of *Pauls* Church. 1658.

BODLEIANA

To the Worthy and much Honoured Mr. W. S. Serjeant at Law.

SIR,

YOU have very much honoured me in the choice of an Opponent: but I perceive by his Concluſion that he hath other buſineſs, and I am not altogether without. And therefore I intreat you the next time to chooſe me an Adverſary that differs from me, or to give me leave to live at Peace. Or if he differ not, let him rather reprehend me for agreeing with him, than pretend a difference where there is none. If your learned Friend do think it as well worth his labor to prove us diſagreed, as I thought it worth mine to prove us of a mind, if I live I ſhall be willing to read what he rejoyns; but if it come not of a greater Errand, I'le promiſe you no more. As to your own pious Labors, they are ſo honeſt and ſavory to me, that they tempted mē to differ from you in one thing, and to think that [an Hypocrite cannot write or preach as well as a good Chriſtian can] there being an unexpreſsible Spirituality that I ſavour in ſome men more then others: but

I'le not stand to this. You give at least as much to the Hypocrite I think as ever I did; and you confirm it by much Scripture-evidence. But I must confess I think not that all your Notes of sincerity are exact or will hold the Tryal; but yet they be usefull in many Cases. You affirm that Hypocrites have common Grace, even to the height expressed by you: but you say, It is not true Grace. Either its Grace or no Grace: if none, call it not common Grace, (or common Faith, Desire, Hope, Love, Joy; if it be none.) But if it be Grace, and not true Grace, then *Ens & Verum non convertuntur*. I maintain that it is not true saving Grace, but yet true common Grace: You maintain in the general that it is not true Grace, and yet its truly common Grace: There being then no Controversie that I see to be disputed between you and me, but whether *Ens & Verum convertuntur*, I crave pardon for my further silence, resolving rather to give you the best (though not to assent) than to dispute it: I remain

A great Esteemer of your Piety and many Labors,

MARCH 31. 1658.

Richard Baxter.

Reader, *I suppose thee to have the* Book *at hand which I here deal with; and therefore have recited but the sum and principal Passages, and not every Word; which thou maist read in the* Book *it self.*

The Contents.

SECT. 1. *The Occasion of this Controversie. An Apologie for this friendly consenting Adversary, to them that are like to be offended with a pretended difference where there is none* fol. 1

Sect. 2. *Our Agreement: The pertinency of my* Impertinencies. *Whether it was not some false Transcript of my words, that the learned Opponent was put to confute? The true Reason of my words in the* Saints Rest *which he writes against, with the meaning of them. Of my Improprieties and incongruities. The point feigned to be mine, which I expresly wrote against, and frequently.* fol. 9

Sect. 3. *Whether Acts of common Grace are Evangelically good? About the stating of the Question. Whether because common and special Grace specifically differ in Morality, it follows that they cannot congruously be said to differ only gradually in any other consideration? Nothing lower than a predominant degree in the matter is capable of the moral form of saving Faith, Love,* &c. *in* specie. fol. 15

Sect. 4. *Whether Grace be as properly and primarily in the Act as in the Habit? and which goes first, which is first to be enquired after? In what principles of habitual Grace it is that special and common Grace or Faith be only acquired by natural abilities with good Education and Industry, or to be infused or wrought by the Spirit as special Grace is?* fol. 20

Sect. 5. *Whether common Faith be Life? Why not so called? Whether Every Degree of accidental forms denominate the Subject? A further Explication of my meaning in this Controversie.* fol. 31

Sect. 6. *Whether the least special Grace be not stronger than the greatest common Grace? Whether the Temporaries Assent be proportionable to the* Mediums *that produce it? Whether the physical forms can be named that specifie common and special*

Grace? Intuition of ſpecial Faith none of the difference. Common Grace prepareth and diſpoſeth for ſpecial Grace. Arguments for the contrary anſwered. Calvins [Qualecunq; ſemen fidei perdunt.] *Whether thoſe that have common Grace, or thoſe that have it not, are more ordinarily converted? What I mean by common Grace. The* Concil. Arauſic. *againſt them that make common Grace to be meerly acquired by our ſelves; but not againſt any thing that I ſay. How far common Grace thus diſpoſeth to ſpecial? This Diſpoſition further proved. The loſing of common Grace proves not the ſpecifick difference.* fol. 35

Sect. 7. *Whether it may be a ſaving Faith that takes the Scripture to be Gods Word, but upon probable motives or mediums? And whether the mediums here prove the ſpecifick difference? Whether the immediate Revelation of the holy Ghoſt be a Premiſe, or Medium, ſpecifying ſaving Faith? And whether all other be fallible and humane? Ten Reaſons to prove that ſuch a Revelation as is in queſtion, is not neceſſary, (nor ordinarily exiſtent.)* fol. 50

Sect. 8. *Whether Hypocrites have no premiſes for Faith, but ſuch as are humane, dubious and fallible? Six Reaſons to prove that they have better. More of the non-neceſſity of demonſtrative or infallible certain mediums, or evidence to prove the Scripture Gods word, as to the being of true Faith. Whether Faith be argumentative, or a ſimple Adheſion, or Affiance? Faith anatomized, as to its divers Acts and Uſes, in anſwer to this queſtion.* fol. 56

Sect. 9. *It is no Article of ſaving Faith, nor divine Faith at all, (much leſs proving a ſpecifick difference) that* I. A. B. *am actually juſtified, freed, pardoned, adopted, and an Heir of Heaven, proved by twenty Reaſons.* fol. 64

Sect. 10. *I made not Love (ſtrictly taken) the form of Faith. That Affiance is in the Will as well as in the Intellect. The enquiry made as of four ſorts of Belief. 1. The Belief of divine Hiſtory, or Truth meerly as ſuch. 2. Of divine Threatnings. 3. Of divine Promiſes, &c. in general. 4. Of the Goſpel in ſpecial. Of nine ſeveral Acts in the third, and ten in the fourth, apparent in the Anatomy. The Acts of Affiance in ſaving Faith*

The Contents.

Faith: One on God as Promiser or Revealer: The other on Christ as Saviour. None of these is the Plerophorie which Rob. Baronius *and the Opponent plead against.* fol. 72

Sect. 11. *The Protestants defended for placing Affiance or Trust in the Will.* Baronius's *two Arguments produced by the Opponent, refelled. Difference how far in the Will. There is* aliquid spei & amoris *in Affiance or Faith, and yet Faith is not Hope or Love. We trust only for good. Eight Reasons proving Affiance in the Will.* fol. 76

Sect. 12. *Some Propositions containing my opinion,* How *far Love belongs to Faith,* Et de fide formata charitate, *necessary to be observed by the learned Adversary, if he will not lose his labor in the next assault on that Subject. Of his Conclusion, and no danger of a passionate railing Reply. The vanity of humane applause, and tolerableness of mans Censures.* fol. 82

Reader,

Reader, I intreat thee first to correct these ERRATA, becauſe they are many and marr the ſenſe.

PAg.4.*lin.* 36.read *beſide*.p.7.*l.*12.blot out *and*. p.10.*l.*14.r.*common Belief & ſpecial*. *l.*20. blot out *it*. *l.*34.r.*read*. p.11.*l.*14. *that here*.p.12.*l.*23.r.*that they have*.p.13.*l.* 22. r.*thee*.p.15.*l.*8.r.*Wills*.p.20.*l*11.r.*Suarez*.p.23.*l.*4,5.r.*branches*. p.24.*l.*35.r.*is it*. p.26.*l.* 15.blot out *ly*.p.27.*l.*13.r.*of ſpecial*.p.28.*l.*35.r.*ob* p.31.*l.*21.r.*in Chriſt*.p.32.*l.*13. r.*denominate*.p.37.*l.*26.r. *ex re præſenti* p. 9.*l.*5.r.*ſpeciei*.*l.*ult.r.*us to be*.p.40.*l.*7. r.*Heathens with*. *l.*10.r. *they l.*34.r. *while*. p.42.*l.*18.r. *prompti*. *l.*19.r. *carnis*. p.44.*l.*1. r.*preſent*. *l.*10.r. *Arts*. p. 46 .*l.* 12.r. *is*. *l.*37.r. *that*. p.47.*l.*25 r. *Death*. *l.*29.r.*ſcrue*. p.49.*l.* 15.r.*loſing*. p. 50.*l.*13.r.*its*. *l.*15.r. *ſay*, *that*. and for *therefore* r. *ſo*. p. 53.*l.*10. r.*recited*. p.54.*l.*9 r.*by*, *ſo that*. p.55.*l* 35. r *believe* p.56.*l.*20,21. r.*Opinion*, *nor Science*. p.57.*l.*6. r. *ſuperficially*.p.60.*l.*25. r.*of*. p.64.*l.*20. blot out *in*. p.68.*l.*ult.blot out *the*.p.69.*l.*31. r. *Truth*.p.73.*l.*4.r. *gifts*. *l.*7.r.*in Scripture*.p.77.*l.*12.r.*the opinion*.*l.*29.r. *of Affiance in the Veracity*.p 78.*l.*32.blot out *eſſential to hope*.p.79.*l.*10.r.*but*.p.80.*l.*4. r.*confine*. *l.*15.r. *poſthumous*. p.81.*l.* 2.r. *threatnings*. *l.*12.r.*as well as of the Intellect*. p.83.*l.*23.r.*want work*. *l.*25.r.*I have firſt*.*l.*35.r.*ſides*.p.84.*l.*25 r. *that every*.p.86.*l.*28.r.*Heſhuſius*.p.87.*l.*22.r.*me*. p.88.*l.*28.r.*lamenting* p 89.*l.*14.and *l.*20.r.*To*.*l.*20.r.*Arminius*.p.94.*l.*16.r.*anſwerable*.

There are many miſ-pointings which marr the ſence,which the *Reader* may obſerve.

Sect. I.

YEt more contending work? No: Whatſoever it may ſeem to thoſe that judge of Books by their Titles; it is an acceptable amicable cloſure of Conſenters, and a Learned Defence of the Truths which I have been long too unlearnedly and unskilfully Defending. And if ſo many good and Learned men have been ſo deeply diſpleaſed with me, for maintaining the ſpecifick Difference between common faith and that which is proper to the Juſtified; Let them now prepare their patience or their valour, when (under my name) they are encountered by a ſtronger hand. For my part, whatever miſtakes of my writings this Learned Author may be guilty of, it ſufficeth me to find him maintaining that Truth, which is deſervedly precious to him and me, and which needeth ſo much clearing in theſe times, that when we have done all, too many will remain unſatisfied.

In the ſecond Edition of a Book called *The Saints Reſt*, I endeavoured according to my weakneſs, to ſhew the true difference between the common Grace that may be found in the unſanctified, and the ſpecial Grace of the Saints which accom-

panieth Salvation. After divers explicatory Propositions, I asserted (in the eighth, ninth, tenth, eleventh and twelfth) *Proposition* 8. that [*God hath not in the Covenant promised Justification and Salvation upon any meer Act or Acts, considered without that degree and suitableness to their Objects, wherein the sincerity of them as saving doth consist*] (the foregoing Propositions explain this) [9. *That there is no one Act considered in its meer nature and kind without its measure and suitableness to its Object, which a true Christian may perform, but an unsound Christian may perform it also.*] (*E.g.* An unsanctified man may esteem God as good, and notionally as the chief Good; but till we esteem him 1, as the chiefest Good, 2. And that with such an effectual serious prevalent estimation, as may win the heart to the most prevalent or predominant Love, it will not save us.) [Prop. 10. *The supremacy of God and the Mediatour in the soul, or the Precedency or prevalency of his Interest in us, above the interest of the flesh, or of inferiour good, is the very point wherein materially the sincerity of our Graces as saving* (i.e. *as they are conditions of salvation, and not meer duties*) *doth consist, and so is the One mark by which those must judge of their states that would not be deceived.*] Prop. 11. [*For herein the sincerity of the Act as saving consisteth, in being suited to its adequate Object, considered in its respects which are essential to it as such an Object. And so to believe in, Accept and Love God as God, and Christ as Christ, is the sincerity of those Acts: But this lyeth in Believing, Accepting and Loving God as the only supreme Authority, &c. Ruler and Good, and Christ as the only Redeemer, and so our soveraign Lord, our Saviour, our Husband, and our Head.*] (This I called the moral specification of the Act.) [Prop. 12. *Therefore the sincerity of saving Grace as saving, lyeth* materially, *not in the bare Nature of it, but in the Degree; not in the degree considered Absolutely in it self, but comparatively as it is prevalent against its contrary.*] And among much more for explication I added, [*I must tell you, that you must still distinguish between a Physical or Natural specification, and a moral: and remember, that our Question is only of a Physical difference, which I deny, and not of a moral, which I make no doubt of.* ———] And [*And furthermore observe, that sincerity of Grace as saving, lyeth in the degree,*

not

not formally, but as it were materially ——— Because the Promise giveth not salvation to the Act considered in its meer Being, and Natural sincerity, but to the Act as suted to the Object in its essential respects: and that suitableness of the Act to the form of its Object consisteth only in a certain Degree of the Act, seeing the lowest Degree cannot be so suted? therefore I say that sincerity lyeth materially as it were, only in the Degree of those Acts, and not in the bare Nature and Being of them.]

By this and much more for explication, I thought I had made my Assertion intelligible, while I maintained, 1. That there was a moral specifick difference, between the Graces of the Regenerate and others, 2. That only the Acts of saving Grace were suited to the very essence or form of the Object; 3. And that it was only materially and Physically, that I said the difference lay but in Degree: that is, gracious Action, are in order first *quid Physicum*, a natural Being, before it be *quid morale*: Or else our Divines would not so commonly teach *de causâ mali*, that God is the Author of all the entity of the Act, but not of the evil: Now as to the Physical Being of the Act, an unsanctified man may have a Belief of the same truths as the sanctified, and a Love to the same God, and a Belief in the same Christ, and a Love to the same Christians, Sermons, Ordinances. *&c.* Yea more then so, they may notionally apprehend the same Reasons for Believing, Loving, *&c.* as the sanctified. But they cannot effectually apprehend these Reasons, and therefore do not esteem God or Love him, with their highest predominant estimation and Love, nor Believe with a faith that is prevalent against their unbelief. And therefore morally, strictly, properly, they are to be said to be *no true Believers, not to love God*, &c. because we are speaking of moral subjects, and of that faith and Love which is the *famosius analogatum*, and most properly so called. And therefore I maintained, that all the unsanctified are called Christians, Believers, *&c.* but Equivocally, or Analogically: But yet that the faith and Love, *&c.* which they have is not all feigned, but true, or Real in its own kind. And this was the sum of my Assertions then.

A while after Dr. *Kendal* wrote a large digression against

ſome part of my Aſſertions: to whom when I had prepared half an Anſwer, at his own peaceable motion, and the Reverend Biſhop *Uſhers*, we agreed on a mutual ſilence, as moſt ſutable to our duties and the good of the Church. But before this Agreement, I had printed one ſheet in the end of the fifth Impreſſion of the *Saints Reſt*, in which I more fully opened my meaning, and ſhewed that Dr. *Kendal* himſelf did ſeem to conſent to what I had aſſerted. The ſame ſheet I had alſo put into the preſs to be affixed to my Confeſſion. Beſides in my Apologie I had at large defended againſt Mr. *Blake*, that all that will be regularly Baptized (at age) or admitted to Church-communion and Sacraments muſt make a credible profeſſion of a ſaving faith ſpecifically diſtinct from the faith of the unregenerate. Hereupon Mr. *Blake* in his Reply had manifeſted much diſpleaſure againſt this Aſſertion, profeſſing his abhorrence of it, that I called the unjuſtified but Equivocally Believers, Chriſtians, Diſciples. Hereupon I wrote a Volume of Diſputations on this very ſubject: Proving that it muſt be the profeſſion of a Faith ſpecifically diſtinct from that of the unſanctified, which all muſt profeſs that we muſt admit to the Sacraments; and that the ungodly are but Equivocally called Believers, Chriſtians, *&c.* In other Treatiſes alſo I had inſiſted on the ſame. And yet all this did not content me, becauſe I heard that others were ſtill diſcontented. And ſome Reverend Learned Miniſters of other Countries, told me with admiration, that though I had ſo expreſly maintained a moral ſpecifick difference between common & ſpecial grace, yet they never ſpoke with one offended man about it, that ever obſerved that, or underſtood me: but perſwaded people confidently that I denied any ſpecifick difference; and had put the queſtion without any ſuch diſtinction or limitation, whether common and ſpecial Grace differ only Gradually, or ſpecifically? It ſeemed to me an incredible thing that ſuch dealing ſhould be ſo common as they told me: But if it were poſſible, I thought I would yet ſpeak plainer, and cauſe men to underſtand that were but willing; and therefore before the explicatory ſheet that was printed in the end of the fifth and ſixth impreſſions of the *Saints Reſt*, and in my *Confeſſion*, and beſides both the foreſaid Volumes

lumes of Disputations, I did somewhat correct the seventh impression of the *Saints Rest*; and added yet another explicatory sheet in the end of it. So that I knew not what I could do more, to be understood.

And now after all this, is brought to my hands a Book of a worthy Gentlemans writing, Mr. *W. S.* a Serjeant at Law, with an Aditional exercitation pretended to be written against my Assertion, by a very Learned man; who doth not only overlook all the forementioned Treatises and explications, but the very Question it self which I discussed, and my forementioned Assertions: feigning me to maintain this general unlimited Assertion, that [*Common and special Grace differ only Gradually.*] At first it struck me into an admiration! But having long known what man is, and considering the quality and employments of the worthy Author, I had store of Apologies presently at hand, sufficient with me to excuse all this, and because I think they should be sufficient with others, that I foresee are like to be Objecting against such kind of dealing: I shall therefore express them, that the Reader may know, that as we are both for one cause, so we are far from any personal distasts, or disaffection, or any uncharitable malicious projects in the management thereof.

If unwritten Tradition may but be taken for a sufficient Reporter of the Authors Name, (which I have no cause to doubt of) I must say, that he is one that I have honoured and very highly esteemed about this twenty years, even ever since I read his six Metaphysical Exercitations, and should have thought it a very great honour and happiness to have been but one of his Pupils: And though I know him not by face, I have reason to be confident that no uncharitable design doth dwell in the breast of a man so Learned, moderate and ingenuous as he is commonly fam'd to be. And therefore as long as we both agree in Loving and defending the Truth of God, the matter is the less if we shew our selves but men towards one another. Nay, I have some reason to call it a happy mistake of my words and meaning in him, which occasioned the communication of this Learned Vindication of the Truth which I more weakly and unskilfully asserted. And I make no doubt but the princi-

pal fault is my own, who by ſome unfit expreſſions have hindred ſuch judicious men from underſtanding me.

Object. *But were not ſo many Explications and Diſputations ſufficient to ſatisfie any man of your meaning?*

Anſw. What Obligation lay on this learned man to read or take notice of any thing of mine? I doubt not, but he had better work to do.

Object. *He ſhould have found time to read and underſtand a mans writtings, before he find time to confute them upon a miſunderſtanding?*

Anſw. He read that which he wrote againſt: And truly if I had lived in the publique Library at *Oxford*, I ſhould have been loth my ſelf to have caſt away my time in reading any ſuch Diſputations or Explications as theſe of mine. If men are ſo unskilfull that they cannot in fewer words ſo ſpeak as to be underſtood; let them at their own blame be miſunderſtood.

Oject. *But he ſhould have read the additional Explications in the ſame Book.*

Anſw. Its like he never ſaw any of thoſe Impreſſions that did contain them.

Object. *At leaſt he ſhould have obſerved the ſection which he confuted.*

Anſw. So he did: For *pag.*332. He confeſſeth that I aſſert, [*that the Acts of common and ſpecial Grace, as they are morally conſidered do differ ſpecifically, and not only in degree.*]

Object. *Why then doth he contend, if he agree, why doth he ſeem to differ, and think it worthy his publique labor to ſeem to differ, where he doth not.*

Anſw. I ſuppoſe it is my terms that he intends his Labor againſt, which he thought might be unfit and ſeem to intimate ſomewhat contrary to my own Aſſertions.

Object. *But why then did he not tell us that it was words only that he ſtrove about, and tell us of more convenient expreſſions in their ſtead? Nay, Why did he overlook the principal terms in your Propoſition? and when you ſay that it is but* Materally, *and not* Formally, *that you place the difference in degree; why doth he ſtill leave out* Materially? *and when you profeſs to ſpeak only*

of

of such a Material Physicall Gradation? Why doth he make the Reader believe that you speak of the formal difference, and simply denyed a specifick difference?

Answ. One word is easily overlookt, yea many: perhaps he lookt only on the followlug words, where in some impressions the word *Materially* was not repeated, (as being before expreſt in the Proposition.) But what great matter is it if we mistake one another, as long as we mistake not the Truths of God.

Object. *It tendeth but to prejudice common Readers, and cause them to cast away mens labors, that might profit them for Brethren to multiply quarrels, and against them, especially when they confess that there is no real difference to occasion it, the thing is the the more without excuse.*

Answ. And what harm is it to the Church or any soul to be brought to a suspicion or distaſt of any thing of mine, or to have any of my writtings become unprofitable to them: Are there not more enough, more usefull and less offensive in the world. Through the Mercy of God it is an age of plenty, and he that savoureth not one mans writtings, may savour and be saved by anothers. I confess some railing rabbious men have done some wrong to our common Hearers, by teaching them to fly from their Teachers as deceivers: but this Reverend Man is an enemy to such waies; and therefore I know not why such a peaceable collation of our different thoughts or expressions should be so offensive as I find it ordinary to be.

Object. *But was not this work sufficiently done already? What need such a multitude of stones to be cast at one mans words even at a few sentences, which they close with themselves, when they have done? Is not that which is here said the same that Dr.* Kendal *had said before? And what need the same be done so oft?*

Answ. Many witnesses give the stronger testimony to a Truth; many may read the writtings of this learned man, that would not have seen or read Dr. *K.* and the great reputation of so eminently learned and discret a man; may add much advantage to the promoting of any truth which he shall defend. Or else Mr. *Tombes* would not have printed the let-

ter

ter against infant-Baptism (which same saith was written by this learned hand) in his Epistle before his third part of Antipedo-Baptism; but that thinking the Truth was on his side, he thought it would be some advantage to it, that so learned a Pen should put a *deleantur* upon the Arguments against it, saying, [*I have read what my learned and worthy friend Dr.* Hammond, *Mr.* Baxter, *and others say in defence of it; and I confess, I wonder not a little that men of such great parts, should say so much to so little purpose; for I have not yet seen any thing like an Argument for it.*] (Though in this I must still profess my Dissent from this very learned worthy man) Yet in the point before us, I rejoyce, that my infirmities have occasioned such an advantage to the truth, as the publication of his Testimony. When I first received his Book, I was busie about satisfying some Reverend Brethren, that were displeased with me for going his way; and therefore received it with some gladness, as that which might ease me of some of my burden, and promote the satisfaction of some of the offended. I have heard somewhat that causeth me to suspect, that a reverend Brother intendeth to write against my second, fourth, and fifth *Disputations of Right to Sacraments*, especially the last, which asserteth that the unregenerate are but equivocally or analogically called Believers, Christians, Disciples, Sanctified, *&c.* If any be upon that work, I intreat them to trie first how they can confute this learned Author; who hath done the same work better (as against me) then I could do. For I will not take the cause as gone, till his Reasons are answered as well as mine. (Perhaps I was beholden to my Appendix to that Disput. for a Testimony from him that never read it.)

This much I have said to let both Papists, and all other Adversaries understand that there is not so much distance among us, for them to reproach us with, as some of our concertations do seem to import. Fencing is not a sign of enmity, though fighting be: and that there is as little disagreement in our Judgements, I shall further manifest by a perusal of the several parts of this pretended Confutation: yet freely acknowledging as I go; Those differences which indeed I find.

SECT.

SECT. 2.

Page 1. HE tells us, 1. That he *believes the difference to be more then gradual*, and so said I. [2. *And that my discourse doth not concludingly evince the contrary;*] nor did it ever pretend it: Thus far we are agreed.

Pag 2. (*i.e.* 332.) He saith that [*To prove that common and special Grace do differ only gradually, I reason,*] *as followeth.* But I never asserted such a thing, and therefore never reasoned for it. It was but overlooking the terms [*Materially,*] and [*Physical specifications*;] and some such like, that caused this mistake.

Here is culled out those words of mine, that were easiliest mistaken, and several considerations added. As to the first, we are agreed that the Question is not of Grace, as it is in God, but in us, or of gracious acts as of us. But my weakness was such, That, 1. I thought, as a presupposed, thing to meet with some that insisted on the name, I might have mentioned exclusively this Grace which this Reverend Brother excludeth, as I did. 2. I thought that *Amor Complacentiæ vel acceptatio divina*, had *denominatione extrinseca* been capable of a gradation; and that as truly, as we say, God loveth one man, and hateth another, and that he loveth him converted, whom he (so) loved not unconverted, (*amore complacentiæ, & acceptationis*) as truly might we say, that he loveth (with that love) a holier & more heavenly upright man, above a scandalous weak Believer, that hath the least goodness, and the most sin that is consistent with sincerity. But I am resolved so far to stope to the learning of this Reverend man, as not to maintain this opinion against him (though I may not be cured of such conceits so soon as he desireth.)

As to his second Consid. *pag.* 323. We are fully agreed, that Grace is ἐπίθετον τι, and that if ever *Titius* and *Sempronius* had Grace, it was not in order of Nature, till after they were men. But I confess I think still, that Grace to *Adam* was not *aliquid naturæ superadditum*, unless you confine the word *Nature* to his meer faculties, as distinct from those right

Diſpoſitions; which were natural to them, though ſeparable.

In his third Concluſion, he receits ſome of my words [*Our Underſtandings and Wils are phyſically the ſame*, &c. and ſaith that, [*This Aſſertion as 'tis here expreſſed, is evidently untrue; for our Underſtandings and Wils, are ſo far from being the ſame* in ſpecie, *&c.*] Still we are agreed whether he will or no. But did I write this falſe Aſſertion? yes, all ſaving one word, yea a ſillable, which is eaſily overlookt. And 2. The falſe meaning which the adjoined words do juſtifie it from; being ſpeaking of the *Matter* of ſaving and common Grace, I thought it not impertinent to mention it as a common Conceſſion, that all of us agree in; [That common knowledge and ſpecial common belief; and ſpecially agree in this general Nature, that both are real knowledge and belief; and that our Underſtandings and Wills are all Phyſically the ſame, and that they agree in the general nature of an Act, yea ſuch as (ſubſtantially at leaſt) have the ſame Object.] Theſe are the haynous words, or the fruits of my greateſt weakneſs it ſeems, that it is manifeſted in that diſcourſe now here. 1. This moſt learned Author did both. *Pag.* 322. and *pag.* 324. ſtill leave out the word [*All*,] (that's but a ſillable.) And 2. The more eaſily feigneth that I ſpeak of the underſtanding and Will, of the ſame perſon, contrary to the drift and plain expreſsions of the diſcourſe which treats of the difference between the Grace of the regenerate and unregenerate: Becauſe I ſaw this exact Diſputant leave out the word [*All*] more then once or twice, I was willing to have found that in ſome one Impreſſion the Printer had omitted it: but I am fruſtrated of that conciliatory excuſe, finding it in the ſecond, third, fourth, fifth, ſixth and ſeventh Impreſſions (which were all: For that diſcourſe was not in the firſt.) But yet I have one excuſe: Perhaps the Reverend Conſuter never reads the Book, but received theſe paſſages tranſcribed by his *Scholar*, that may be more prone and willing to miſtake. And if I had ſaid, that the ſaid faculties are but *formaliter*, *vel denominatione extrinſeca*, diſtinct from the ſoul, and from each other, he very well knows what great ſtore of company I had had,

had, and that of the higheſt foorms in the ſcools which might have put ſome honor on a perſon ſo inconſiderable as I: and every man of the third form, that calls the difference reall, is not in love with the notion of a ſpecificke difference, though commonly they agree: But this is nothing to our Debate.

Page 325. He ſaith, That [*this makes nothing to the preſent purpoſe, nor any way proves that common and ſaving Grace differ not ſpecifically.*]

Anſw. Still we are agreed, whether he will or no: Though it make not to the purpoſe, it may be mentioned excluſively, or as a common conceſſion, preſuppoſed to the purpoſe as himſelf here innocently mentioneth it: and if it will not prove that there is *no Difference*, it will ſhew here that the *Difference is not*.

But he ſaith, *It is wholly impertinent*, &c.]

Anſw. 1. See all you that are adverſaries to the honor of our Unity, that we are ſo far from diſagreeing in Articles of faith, that we will not ſuffer ſo much as an *Impertinency* in one another without a reprehenſion. 2. I am ſorry for an Impertinency, but I am glad that it is not falſe. 3. Its impertinent to your *purpoſe*, but not to *mine*.

Once for all, this was my reaſon of theſe paſſages. 1. I knew by long experience, abundance of people that credibly and confidently profeſſed to have ſome real undiſembled deſires to be ſober, and yet lived in drunkenneſs; and to be godly, and yet had little of it in their practiſe, and to have a Love to the godly, (and truly would do and ſuffer ſomewhat for them, but yet loved the world and themſelves ſo much better, that they would be at no great coſt or danger for them: ſuch a Love they profeſt to Chriſt himſelf, and a credible profeſſion they made of a true dogmatical belief. And theſe men were many of them deeply poſſeſſed by miſtaking our Divines, that the leaſt true (or real) deſire after Chriſt or Grace, was ſaving Grace it ſelf, and would certainly prove that the perſon ſhould be ſaved, ſo that ſome of them that lived in ordinary drunkenneſs for many years, would after they had been drunk cry out of their ſin, and be ready to tear

their hair, and profeſs themſelves unworthy to come among Chriſtians; and yet ſtill would profeſs that they were confident of pardon by the blood of Chriſt, becauſe they were as certain as that they lived, that they hated their ſin as ſin, and deſired to be godly, and could wiſh themſelves in the ſtate of the beſt, and did believe all the word of God to be true, becauſe it is God's that cannot lie, and had felt experimentally the ſweetneſs and power of it on their hearts, and did truſt on Chriſt alone for Salvation. I do not feign this, but have found it in old and common Drunkards, and ſuch like, for many & many years together. Now the work that I had to do with theſe perſons was to convince them that ſuch good deſires as are habitually, and in ordinary practice conquered by fleſhly, worldly deſires, will never prove the ſoul to be ſanctified: and ſuch a Belief as is conquered by unbelief or ſenſuality, will never prove a man to be juſtified; and ſuch a love to God and the godly, as is conquered by a greater love to carnal ſelf, and the world, may ſtand with a ſtate of condemnation. *O but* ſay they, *we are certain that we diſſemble not; Theſe deſires, Belief, Love, &c. We have.* Should I ſay, that they lie, and have none ſuch, they would never believe me, nor ſhould I believe my ſelf, becauſe I believe the Scripture, and the credible Profeſſions of men. I conclude therefore they have that ſuch acts as they affirm, and that they are Analogically good (in moral ſenſe,) and come from the common Grace of Chriſt: but that beſides the Reality of theſe acts, they muſt have them in ſuch a predominant degree, as is ſuited in its Eſſentials to the Object, and will overcome their contraries in the main bent of heart and life, and prove predominant habits in the ſoul, before they can hence conclude that they are ſanctified: Where note, that the men that I ſpeak of, trie not their acts by a ſutableneſs to the object in its relative perfections, nor do they once know, or at leſt conſider of the moral reſpective formality of theſe Graces; but look all at the Act as it is exerciſed on God, Chriſt, Scripture, Saints, ſubſtantially conſidered, or if conſidered as Good, True, *&c.* yet not effectually apprehended as the chief good, moſt certain neceſſary Truth, *&c.* So that it is the ſubſtance or matter

ter (as its commonly called) of their Belief, Love, Desire, *&c.* That our question with such men is about: And therefore my business with them was to shew them what it is in the *Matter and Substance* of these Acts that is necessary to prove them *formally, specifically saving*, viz. that besides the right conceptions of the object, the act must be in such a prevalent Degree, as will prove a predominant Habit in the soul; and that such uneffectual Acts as are before described, may stand with a state of condemnation. Hereupon it is, that though Grace is specified and to be denominated from its moral form; yet my business led me to prove that this moral form was inconsistent with any degree of the physical Act, but what was ordinarily thus prevalent or predominant: And therefore to assert that this moral form did lie in a physical degree of the matter, and that a lower subdued degree of the Act, was matter uncapable of such a form, though it was capable of the general Nature of (an Analogical at least) Vertue, Duty or moral Good, denominated from some answerableness to the Precept, (at least *secundum quid*) yet it was not capable of the special form of that Faith, Love, Desire, *&c.* to which God hath promised Salvation, as the Condition.

Reader, Once more I have as plainly given then my meaning as I can speak: Forgive me these Repetitions and consider the occasion. So that you see, this Learned, Reverend man doth build all his opposition on a meer mistake, supposing me to speak of the *Form*, who spoke only of the *Nature* of the Act, or the *Physical Matter*, (as before expressed.) And now I make thee the Judge of my Impertinences.

The same answer serves to his fourth Consid. and his [*quid hoc ad Iphicli Boves*,] (who have been so long in the yoak that they are ready to lie down:) and to his Question [*Will it hence follow that all Belief*, &c. *are specifically the same?*] *Answ.* No. We are here agreed too: But it is no such new thing to call either our faculties the subject matter of the Acts, or the *Acts* the *Matter* of our *Grace*, but that I might pardonably suppose, that I might meet with some such silly soul as would use such a notion: and if it will but follow, that [*In this much, there is no physical specifick difference*] It serveth my ends.

Page 327. Consid. 5. He again receiteth the same passage, that [*The Understanding and Will are physically the same.*] And again, The third time leaves out *All*, when I said, *Our Understandings and Will are physically all the same:* which more perswades me that he never read the Book which he confutes, but took his *scholars* transcript, and see still our happy Agreement. The charge here is but [*impropriety and incongruity.*] (And I heard ere now from one of his scholars, that I could scarce *speak congruously.*) but I would I could have spoken *Intelligibly*. But I am glad that I spoke not *falsely*. *The first Incongruity or Impropriety* is, that I call all our understandings and wills [*like substances*] when they are but *Accidents.*] But 1. An Act is but an Accident, and yet what more common phrase, then *substantia Actus*, when we distinguish it from the Moral Form. Read first his own Exercitation, *de malo.* and then judge. 2. I ventured long ago to tell him, my Reconcileableness to the *Scotists Nominals* &c. and that I made it no Article of my faith; that the faculties are Really distinct from the soul, and then they may be substances. For I am of their mind that think the soul is not a meer Accident. And if all the Rabbies of that mind in the Popish schooles have no Authority, I may modestly say with one of our higest Foorm at home [*Quod Physophantur voluntatem & intellectum, esse duas Potentias reipsâ distinctas, dogma Philosophicum est, ab omnibus haud receptum, & Theologicis dogmatibus, firmandis aut infirmandis, fundamentum minimè idoneum.* Davenant Determ. Q. 37. pag. 166.]

My next incongruity is, that I say they are of [*like substance*] having said that they are Physically the same. *Answ.* Had I said that they are *Numerically* the same, and yet [*of like natures*] I had spoke *incongruously.* But O that I were as wise or Learned a man as they that ordinarily call a *specifical unity* by the name of [*a likeness*;] if the Latine [*similes*] hit them not, yet the English [*Like*] may. For our [*Like*] in English is most ordinarily extended to expres [*a specie*] (But think not that I am teaching you English, but excusing my incongruities as far as is meet.) And if all this will not do, I will try to prevent your next work in this kind, by shewing you what a discou-

raging

rageing task is before you. If you will but write upon all the improprieties of my writings, it may put you to such a voluminous toyl, as may make you repent it before you have done, and make your Reader think me some worthy learned man, whose very improper speeches deserve the observation of so eminent a man.

3. You next grant me that our several Understandings and Will, are not specifically distinct,) so far still we are Agreed. But you say [*it follows not but their Acts may.*] still we are Agreed. And in *N.* 5. and 6. you say, that [*they do not only gradually differ,*] still we are Agreed, even in your instances.

*Pag.*329. Your sixth Consid. reciteth my opinion as you thought, but indeed not mine, *viz.* [*that the difference is only gradual, and not specifical.*] Again you leave out [*materially*] and the other limiting expressions: And why did I say, [*You thought this mine*] When *pag.*332. You confess the contrary is mine.

Yet here let me tell you once for all, that if my terms of [*a Physical specification*] on the reason given of that Name, be judged by you improper (which I yet find you not affirm) I am resolved not to defend them against you, but am ready with thankfulness to learn a fitter manner of expression, as verily believing my self to be fitter to be your scholar, then your Antagonist in Philosophy, especially the terms.

Sect. III.

YOur first Reason for my Opinion (pretended against it) is long ago agreed to: Nay, see the height of our Agreement: I have over and over expressed my consent to this part of your Reason, in which you know how currantly the schoolmen and our own Divines are against you, *viz.* [*That the Acts of common Grace in the unregenerate, are not so much as Evangelically good.*] But yet that I seem not to hold what I do not, I must add, that I mean that they have not that *Moral goodness*, which in the first and most proper sense deserves that Denomination; but yet that they are, not only *less evil*, nor only

materially

materially good; but also that they are properly *good*, *secundum quid*, *& in tantum*, and that they have such an *Analogical goodness*, as Accidents have an entity: which is not Nothing: And though they may all be called sin, yet they have somewhat in them that is better then sin: or else you were to blame for calling them *common Grace*: yea, I doubt not but such Acts as you say are but *splendida peccata*, have had from God a temporal Reward; yea and have been preparatory to the Reception of saving Grace. Some Duties God requireth of the unregenerate, as a means to their Regeneration, which some of them do perform. And though he Accept them not so far as to esteem them either conditions of Justification, or Properties of the justified, yet so far doth he Accept them, as that ordinarily he judgeth and useth them as *fitter* for saving Grace then others. If they could do nothing towards their own sanctification, God and his Ministers would have spared many words that are used to them. And if there were no more likelyhood that they should find Grace in Hearing, Reading, consideration, Asking it, *&c.* then in doing nothing, or plunging themselves in sin, we would say less to them then we do, to put them on such means. I hope you will not differ from me in this.

Page 332. The explication of my mind, you call a Confession, and so confess [*that upon evident Reason, I confess that the Acts of common and special Grace, as they are morally considered, differ specifically, and not only gradually.*] So that if the Reader believe either you or me, we are agreed in the decision of the Queston it self. And then I can easily excuse the opposition of a profest Consenter, though I understand not the intent of it.

But you say that [*When the Question is put, how common and special Graces differ? the Answer must ever be Affirmative, that they differ* specie, non gradu solùm.] *Answ.* 1. I thought that *Question* [*How common and special Graces differ?*] Had not been capable of an Affirmation or Negation: But if my thoughts were improper, I submit. 2. I am confident that in sense, I shall here also agree with you, whether you will or no.

1. If the Question be put in your terms, I confess my opini-

on

on was, that the Answer should be applied to the comprehensiveness of the Question, and I should say that [*They differ formally thus*, & quasi *materially, thus and thus*] and so speak to both. But if 2. the Question had been, [*Whether common and special Grace do differ specifically.*] I should alwaies affirm it (supposing but such a specifick difference, as between substance and Accident, or an Egg and a Bird, or an Embrio and a Beast, remembring that *omne simile est etiam dissimile*, least I be misinterpreted.) For when we speak of a moral subject, we must suppose the Question simply put, to be morally meant according to the nature of the subject: which are my very words in several published writings. And I think verily that this is all you mean. 3. But this was nothing to my Question, which was [*Whether materially, or by a physical specification, common and special Grace do differ.*] And this I did deny, and thought a gradual difference enough, supposing the Acts in both persons to be such as go commonly under the same name, and have at least substantially the same object (as to believe the Promise, Christ, &c.) Now I apprehended that if you had put the Question to me. [*How man and beast differ* quoad Corpus, *or* quoad animam sensitivam, &c.] the answer must not be the same as if you had simply askt me, *how man and beast differ.*] Had I been askt, *Whether the Love of a Suiter and of a Husband differ specifically as to the matter?*] I should have said, *No* (nor perhaps gradually:) but yet *formally*, in a civil moral sence, they differ *specifically*, (yet I know heres greater difference in the matter in our case). Had I been askt [*Whether the reverence and heart-subjection, which I have to a Captain and to the General, to a Justice of Peace, Lieutenant*, &c. *and to the Soveraign, do differ specifically* quoad materiam:] I should have said *No*, but *gradually*. But yet *quoad formam civilem, they differ specifically?* Yet I am ready to let go these expressions when you will; I must profess, a word under your hand would have caused me to disuse them, without this publick work that you are put upon. Do but tell me you dislike the phrases, and you shall never hear (without such Necessity as I expect not) that ever I will publickly use them more. I hate troubling the Church with contending for meer words at least, unless I were better

ac wording my conceptions then I am.

But ſtay, I find my ſelf already under the Obligation: *Pag.* 333. You plainly ſay, [*that if in their moral conſideration, they ſtill differ ſpecifically from common Graces, it can never with any congruity be affirmed, that in any other conſideration, they differ only gradually?*] Strange! Why ſo? [*For inſtance, when its ſaid that in their Natural and Phyſical conſideration, they differ only in Degree; I Reply, that the Acts of the Will and Underſtanding in that conſideration are not ſaving Graces at all.*] You have ſilenced me, when I have done with this account of my Diſſent, though you have not convinced me, (having as great advantage as moſt men living to have done it, in my eſteem of your great abilities.) 1. If this Reaſon be good, then I muſt ſpeak of *nothing* but the *form* of any *Being*; nor may I congruouſly mention any *material* or *Accidental difference*. For they are not denominated from matter or Accidents. May I not ſay that a Crow and an Ouſel are of one colour, becauſe that *quâ colorati* they are not denominated ſuch. May I not ſay that a *Swan* and *a ſheep quoad colorem* do differ only gradually, though *quoad colorem* they are not a *Swan or ſheep?* May I not ſay, that *materially a Ship* and *a Barge* do differ but gradually, becauſe *ex materia* they are not a *Ship* or *Barge?* Or that *materially a Dagger and a ſword* do differ but *gradually*, becauſe that *ex materia* they are not called *a ſword or dagger?* I am not yet convinced of theſe things; but for your ſake I purpoſe to ſay no more of it publickly.

You add, [*And therefore if it be granted that in that conſideration they differ only Gradually, yet it will not thence follow, that common and ſpecial Graces differ only in Degree.*] *Anſw.* Very true: becauſe this is an Aſſertion of them *ſimply* conſidered, and *formally*, and not *limited ad materiam*. But if you will grant that *materially* they differ but in Degree, you grant my Propoſition *in terminis* (as to that much.)

I rather ſuſpect that when the buſineſs is well opened, the Difference will be between me and moſt that are offended with me, [*whether indeed they materially differ ſo much as in degree?* And they will ſay, that *a Lower Degree may conſiſt with the true Form*: And then men will ſee that it is *their* bringing

Grace

Grace *materially lower* then I do, and not their *advancing it formally higher* that is our Difference. Sure that Reverend Doctor that hath already oppoſed me in this Point, doth harp upon that ſtring. But I could wiſh they would let this be plainly underſtood: I think not ſaving Grace *materially* ſo *Low a thing* as they: and *formally* I think it *as high as they do*. But let ſuch underſtand that it is towards the *ſame object*, that the *Acts*, muſt be compared, and not as exerciſed on *different objects*. A wicked man may have a clearer knowledge of *earthly things* then a true Chriſtian hath of *God and Heaven*; but not ſo intenſe, and powerful, effectual a knowledge of *God and Heaven* as a Chriſtian hath: ſo for Belief, Deſire, Love, *&c.*

You add [*This Argument, common and ſpecial Belief as they are Phyſically conſidered, differ only, gradually: therefore common and ſpecial Graces differ only gradually*] *in plain Engliſh, is no more then this*, [*Things which are no Graces at all differ only gradually; therefore common and ſpecial Graces differ only in Degree.*]

Anſw. But the concluſion is yours and not mine; or equally renounced by you and me: My Propoſition was, that [*materially they differ but in Degree.*] And in plain Engliſh, thats no ſuch thing as you make it of your own pleaſure; but this much [*Thoſe things which in reſpect to the Preceps are called Duties; and in reſpect to the Promiſe are called Conditions, do yet materially differ but in Degree.*] Or [*thoſe gracious Acts which have Analogically the form of Duties, and ſo of Graces, but not the Form of Conditions, that is, ſaving Graces do yet materially differ but in Degree from thoſe that have that Form.*] This was the true ſence of my Propoſition. And whereas I put [*as ſaving*] into it, it was but to expreſs that it was *Grace as ſaving*, (reſpecting the Promiſe) and *not Grace as meer duty* (reſpecting the bare Precept) *whoſe material Difference* I enquired after. Only I think that there is a certain Degree of the Phyſical Act of Neceſſity to make it the matter of ſuch a Form. For it will dwell in no other matter. Againſt this the late Opponents ſeem to make a lower Degree of matter capable: And thoſe that formerly I was wont to converſe with, did think that a higher ſort of matter was Neceſſary, of whom I ſpoke af-

ter that Propoſition: of which more anon about infuſed Grace.

Sect. IV.

Till the eighth Conſid. you do but expreſs your further Conſent.

In Conſid. 8. *pag.* 334. 335. You ſay [*that common and ſpecial Graces conſiſt not ſo properly and primarily in the Acts and exerciſe of Faith and Love*, &c. *as in the Habits and principle from whence they come, ſo that the graciouſneſs that is in them is not* (*as ſnares*, &c.) ipſis actibus originaliter intrinſeca, *&c.*] *Anſw.* 1. I require ſome proof before I believe it, that Grace is not as much originally intrinſick in the Acts as Habits? Our Divines that have long taught us that the Act of Faith is it that Juſtifies; (and alſo that the Acts of Faith and Repentance, go before the Habit,) thought otherwiſe. 2. For my part, I have irons enow in the fire: I have not engaged my ſelf in this Controverſie, and ſee no reaſon why I ſhould [*whether the Habit or Act be firſt?*] I long thought as *Pemble*, that the Habit was firſt. But ſecond thoughts have made me at leaſt doubtful, and looſened from that opinion; and finding that the ſtream of Proteſtant Divines have taken *Vocation* to be Antecedent to *ſanctification*, and that *Vocation* conteineth (*paſſivè ſumpta*) the *Acts* of *faith and Repentance*, and *ſanctification* the *Habit*; I have reſolved that without further Light, I will never more oppoſe this opinion. Its a probable way (as *Camero* expreſſeth it) that the Holy Ghoſt by the word without a habit, exciteth the firſt Act by the means of the preſented Object: and that *eodem inſtanti* by that Act he produceth a Habit, ſo that only in order of Nature the Act is firſt, but not of time: The Spirit is as the Hand, the Object and Word as the Seal, the Act of impreſſion on the intellect is firſt in order of Nature, and ſo upon the Will the impreſſed Act and Habit immediately are effected by it. 3. We uſe to ſay, that *Habitus infuſi ſe habent ad modum acquiſitorum*: though they have a higher power effecting them, its improbable that they are effected

cted in another order. 2. This suiteth with the Nature of man. 3. And this makes the word the Instrument of that work, whereas (which moves me very much) according to the contrary opinion, the Word cannot possibly be the Instrument, or means of our Regeneration, as to the Habit, but only a subsequent means to excite or educe the Act, which seems against the stream of Scripture, and Divines of all Ages. But truly my opinion is, that as the *wind bloweth where it listeth*, &c. *so is every one that is born of the Spirit*: And that no man can so trace the Spirit of God as to be able certainly to say whether the Act or Habit of Grace be first. But it seems more probable and congruous to Scripture to place the act first in Nature, but in one instance of time. But I will not contend with any man that thinks otherwise.

3. I am past doubt that the Acts of Grace are first discerned: Nay for my part, I know not what it means to discern any Habit in my self but by the Acts. And therefore the Acts in that respect must be first sought after.

4. But I am thus far wholly of your mind, that no act can prove a man truly sanctified, but as it proves a Habit: and that ungodly men may by sickness, convictions, common Grace, *&c.* be carried far in Acts: and that our principal-satisfaction about our sincerity is by finding Predominant Rooted *Habits*, which are as a New Nature to the soul. Thus far we are agreed.

From all this I answer your inference, *pag.* 336. *That he that enquires, whether common and special Graces differ specifically, or only gradually, should (if he will) rationally proceed first, and principally enquire concerning the Habits, &c.*

Answ. But 1. You must not take your Reasons (from the Habits priority, *&c.*) for granted, as long as it is a singular opinion among Protestants, and unproved. 2. That must be first enquired after, which is first, (and only *immediately in se*,) discernable: but such is the act of Grace, and not the habit; *Ergo, &c.* 3. However, If you will confute me, you must confute the position that I (whether rationally or irrationally) disputed for, and not make another of your own, and dispute for that, and take it for a confutation. 4. But for my part, I take not the Acts and Habits so much to differ;

but (as on the by I toucht it at first, so) I shall consent that you put both hereafter into the question : but yet remember, that I put them not in mine at first.

Page 337. You say, [*We are now come to the hing and foundation of this Controversie, &c.*] which you lay down in this Position, *The habits of special and* [*saving Grace, are not only gradually, but specifically distinct from the habits and Acts of all common Grace whatsoever.*]

Answ. 1. I am wholly on your side ; and where you have wrote a leaf for it, I think I have written many : so that if bulk might go for worth and weight, I had over-merited you in this Controversie. 2. But I intreat you, if you delight in this kind of work, that hereafter you will make no hinges or foundations of controversies with me without my own consent : either let me agree with you in the stating of the question, or else pretend not that you dispute against me.

Your reasons to *page* 349, do learnedly militate for the Assertion that I maintain : and though some words on the by lie not so even with my conceptions, yet I thankfully accept your consent in the main.

Your principal position also *pag.* 352. is the same with mine and I have no mind to quarrel with so fast a friend, yet I am so far off *Becanus* and *Maldonates* mind, as to think that where miraculous and justifying faith are together, they differ no more (at most) then the sensitive and rational soul in the same man. But I am not of their mind, that they are not separable. And for historical Faith, if you mean the assent to the truth of Scripture, I take it to differ from justifying faith as much as the Intellect doth from the man, and no more. And for temporary faith, I take it to contain (oft at lest) more then bare Assent, and to be a superficial common Assent, Consent and Affiance, having materially all the Acts of saving faith, but none of them in sincerity, that is with a rooted predominant Habit, and prevalent effectual Acts, but is a liveless dreaming, uneffectual thing. But this on the by.

To your reasons. 1. I consent (*pag.* 354.) that the *heart is stony* ; yet (as Dr. *Harris* saith,) hath a natural tenderness, sometimes, and a superficial tenderness from common Graces.

2. I

2. I conſent that Temporary faith hath not [*depth of earth*] or [*much earth,*] as Chriſt ſaith, *Mat.*13.5. which is the ſame with [*no root*:] for had it not had ſuperficial rooting, it had never come to a blade and ear. What inſition the branch is in Chriſt not bearing fruit had, 1 *John* 15. I leave to further enquiry. But ſome, how they are ſaid to be in Chriſt.

3. I grant that the Temporary faith brought forth no fruit that is *no ſpecial Fruit*: for no doubt, but it may bring forth, much *common fruit*; moſt think ſo far, as that ſuch may give their bodies to be burnt. And Mr. *Shepheard* in your Book doth mention a great deal.

4. I eaſily grant alſo that Temporary faith is cowardly, and fails in trial: in all this we are agreed.

Page 359. You begin your *more diſtinct confirmations*: Though I agree with you in the cauſe, yet not in every word of your Confirmations. Your firſt difference is in [*the Nature of the Principles, & cauſes whence they ſpring; Common belief being generally an acquired diſpoſition or Habit produced by the ability of our Natural Underſtanding, aſſiſted with good education and induſtry: but ſaving Faith the immediate work of the Spirit: one is* Habitus acquiſitus, *the other* infuſus.] *Anſ.*1, Either you mean here the *Extrinſick* [*Principles and Cauſes*] or the *Intrinſick*. If the *Intrinſick*, then either the *ſoul*, the *faculties*, or the *Habits*: not the *Habits*; For its thoſe that are now the ſubject of your Queſtion; and therefore you call them not [*the Principles and Cauſes*] o themſelves, though you might call them ſo as to the Acts. Not the *faculties*, nor the *ſoul*; for you yield before that the *ſoul* or *faculties* of Regenerate and unregenerate differ not ſpecifically. It is therefore the *extrinſick* [*Principles and Cauſes*] that you meant. And if ſo, it is either *God himſelf*, or ſome *Action of God*, hat is a *middle thing* between the *Agent* and the *Effect*, or It is the *Inſtrumental Cauſe*. Not the *Inſtrument*: For 1. You expreſs a Higher cauſe, 2. and the ſame word is the inſtrument of God in cauſing a common & ſpecial Faith: the ſame ſeed fell on the good ground and the ſtony. Nor is it God himſelf you that mean: for he is not of *a ſpecies*, much leſs of *different ſpecies*, as he is the Principle and Cauſe of different effects: Nor is his *Will* ſo:

for

for his Will is his Essence. Yet I would (as aforesaid) confess that *Denominatione extrinsecâ*, his *Will* or *Love* may have divers *Denominations*, according to the diversity of *effects*: But yet not denominated *specifically* divers from every distinct *specification* in the effects. Nor can it be your meaning, I think, that *specifically distinct-wills* in God are the *causes*: For you say *pag.* 322. 323. [*The favour and Love of God to his people comes now into consideration*, ——1. This is *subjective in Deo*, ——— 2. *Because the Grace of God in this notion as it signifieth his love to us is not capable of any degrees; the Love of God, as all other Acts of the Divine Nature, being like God himself absolutely simple without any composition essential or gradual.*] Not to enquire how that which [*is God himself*] can be *like God himself*, (for we all speak incongruously sometimes) from hence its plain that it is not the *Love of God as in himself* that you call [*the Principles or Causes.*] It remains then that it must be some *Action* or *Emanation intermediate*, or as passing from God to the effect. But thats not likely neither: For 1. You seem to be most friendly to the *Thomists* in other points; and you know that they and many more (with many of our own) do maintain that there is no more Execution or Operation necessary *ex parte Dei* but his meer *Velle*; and that his willing the effect to be thus or thus, at this or that time existent, doth produce it. 2. Your self said, *ubi sup.* [*The favour and Love of God is* subjective in Deo, & terminative *only in* nobis.] 3. If there be an *operation* distinct *ab operante & re operatâ*, it is a *Creature* or the *Creator*: Not the *Creator*, for he is the *Agent*; if a *Creature*, they that will prove a specifick difference in it, must first tell us *what creature* it is? and shew us the *general Nature* of it. 4. Many Philosophers think it inconsistent with Gods immediate Attingencie and Operation, *immediatione virtutis & suppositi*. So that I scarce think that in this you place the specifick Difference, or gather them to be *toto cœlo distant*, as you say.

But it is not imaginable that you may mean to oppose the *extrinsick and intrinsick* Causes in the different persons, as if [*mans own faculties*] were the cause of *Temporary* faith, and [*Gods Will*] the cause of *saving* faith? No I dare not entertain such

ſuch a conjecture. For 1. I doubt not but you will yield, that temporary faith could *not* be produced without the will of God: At leaſt, they that think man cannot determine his own will to the act of ſin, till God doth phyſically pre-determine it; will I hope yield that man cannot Temporarily Believe without the will of God. 2. And I reſt aſſured that you will yield that that mans ſoul, or faculties, is the ſubject of both common and ſpecial Grace. 3. And that the faculties are as much efficient in the Production of ſpecial Grace as of common. So that if they are not efficient of ſpecial Grace, then not of common. Of which more anon. 4. Or if that were denied, yet as long as they have both the ſame will of God for their Original, you confeſs one to have as High a Principle as the other. And though (as is ſaid) *denominatione extrinſecâ*, we may ſay that it is a *ſpecial Love* that is the cauſe of one, and but a *common love* that is the cauſe of the other, (becauſe one is the willing a ſpecial good, and the other of a common) yet it is *Unity* that is the *Original* of *multiplicity*. One Will of God cauſeth both.

One more conjecture: May you not mean that *God immediatly* is the cauſe of *ſpecial faith*, and *God by the Word* is the cauſe of *Temporary* faith, and ſo oppoſe the *principal cauſe alone*, to the *Principal with the Inſtrument*? No, that cannot be: becauſe 1. As long as God is the Principal cauſe of both, by the ſame will, the uſe of an Inſtrument in one only will prove no ſpecifick Difference. 2. Becauſe our Divines (and others, except ſome *Enthuſiaſts*) are commonly agreed, that the word is the Inſtrument of working ſaving faith as well as Temporary (though I confeſs I know not how that will conſiſt with their opinion, that ſay the Habit is before the Act, ſeeing it is ſcarce conceiveable how the Word ſhould cauſe a Habit without firſt cauſing an Act.) 3. Beſides, its commonly affirmed, that God doth effect *immediatione virtutis & ſuppoſiti*, as well when there is an Inſtrument as when there is none.

I am therefore left uncertain of your ſenſe: but which ever it is, I ſee not how it will hold. It is moſt likely that you diſtinguiſh of Gods *modus operandi*, as to ſome *Influxe*, or *cauſing Action* between the Agent and the Subject, becauſe the *In-*

fusion and *Acquisition* mentioned, rather intimates that then the other. As if by a meer General assistance or concurse God caused Temporary faith, and by a special coucurse or assistance or Pre-determination he caused special faith: But besides what is said before to that, if we might imagine such a mediate Being between God and the effect, as is capable of such a difference as you express, yet that here there can be no such thing, will appear by what follows, but I will first consider your own expressions.

You say, that [*common Beliefe is an Acquired faith produced by the Ability of our own understandings, assisted with good education and industry.*] *Answ.* 1. There is oft as much use of our own understandings, industry, and of Education for a special faith as a Temporary; But these alone will not serve turn ly. 2. You seem here and all along this Paragraph, flatly to maintain that Temporary faith is only thus of our selves, or only Acquired, and not wrought by any other help of God, and his Spirit, then what is Generally necessary to all Acts. But that common or temporary Faith is the work of Gods Spirit as well as saving faith, is most express in Scripture: And that it may as truly be called *Infused*, and that it is from a *special assistance* of the Spirit, I shall prove: (*special*l I say, as opposed to *meer general help or concurse*, though not *special*, as that signifieth what is proper to the saved.) 1. As to your self you confess, *pag.*338. [*that there are many common Graces of the soul —— sometimes immediatly and extraordinarily infused by God.*] And if *some* common Graces are infused, you are much disabled from proving that the *Temporary* or common Grace of the best of the unregenerate is *not infused*.

2. The word [*Infusion*] being a Metaphor, must be resolved into that proper expression which you will own. If it signifies but a Collation, Donation, or effectual operation of the Holy Ghost then common Graces are *Infused* as well as proper. If it signifie an Operation without means, so neither common nor proper Grace is ordinarily infused (at least into the Adult.) If it signifie that which is Given by more then General Providence, and requireth more then our own industry and Education (which you mention) to attain it, then this common Grace

is

is infused: (We call it common, not because all have it, nor because a Help common to all is enough to work it; but because it is so common to the unsanctified, as not to be proper to the Saints.)

3. I know no Scripture that appropriateth the Title of [*Infused*] to the Grace proper to the Saints! And sure I am that some *means* is appointed to be used for the Acquisition of special Grace: And therefore so far as those means succeed, it may be called *Acquired*, as well as *Infused*. *Prov.*1.23. The Promise of *Infusion* and *Effusion*, [*I will pour out my Spirit to you*] is either meant of *common mercy*, q. d. *I will pour out the teachings and perswasions of my Spirit to you, in my Word, and the teaching of my Ministers.*] Or else, if it speak of *Infusion especial Grace*, it requireth [*Turning at Gods Reproof*] as a meanes antecedent; that of *Isa.*44 3 4,5. & *Joel.*2.28,29. are commonly expounded of common as well as special Grace: and one of them is so expounded by the Holy Ghost, *Acts* 2.17,18. *Zech.*12.10. seems to speak only of special Grace; but some extend it further.

4. Certain I am that both the Gifts of Prophesie, Tongues, Healing, *&c.* are *Given*, yea *Infused* by the Spirit; and that Temporary faith is the Gift of the Spirit, and not meerly Acquired as you describe. This therefore is the main thing that yet I find my self to differ from you in: I conceive that those that were *enlightned, and tasted of the Heavenly Gift, and were made partakers of the Holy Ghost, and have tasted of the good Word of God, and the powers of the World to come* [had more then meer aquired Acts or Habits. How else are they said to be *made partakers of the Holy Ghost?* And how are they said [*to be sanctified by the blood of the Covenant, and after to do despight to the spirit of Grace*, if they had none of the spirit of Grace? *Heb.*10.29.& 6.4,5. I speak on supposition that the common Exposition be sound, that takes these Texts as speaking of common Grace. I confess I have not such high thoughts of mans sufficiency as of himself in estate of unregeneracie, as to think (as you here seem to do) that he can acquire such things by his own understanding, industry, and by Education, without the work of the Spirit of Christ, (yea the immediate work (though

not without means) as Scripture tels us the unregenerate have posſeſſed. I think their Grace is *cœli ſoboles* too; and that Nature and induſtry will not reach ſo high of themſelves, or by general concurſe, as to [*waſh theſe ſwine, and cauſe them to eſcape the pollutions of the World, through the knowledge of the Lord and Saviour Jeſus Chriſt*, 2 Pet. 2. 20 21. *To receive the Word with joy*, Luke 8. 13. *and believe for a while*: John 2. 23. 24. To ſpare citations; ſee but all thoſe great things that Mr. *Shepheard* in your Book aſcribeth to Hypocrites, & judge whether they are not beyond our corrupt nature to reach by way of meer Aquiſition? When *Paul* hath [*given us to underſtand, that no man can ſay that Jeſus is the Lord, but by the Holy Ghoſt*, 1 *Cor.* 12. 3. And though its like he hath reſpect to thoſe times of perſecution, when confeſſing Chriſt was the way to ſuffering, yet how far many unſanctified ones have gone in confeſſing him, and ſuffering for him, I need not tell you. [*There are diverſities of Gifts, but the ſame Spirit. To one is given the word of wiſdom by the Spirit, to another the Word of Knowledge by the ſame Spirit: to another faith by the ſame Spirit* ——— *By one Spirit we are all Baptized into one Body* ——— 1 *Cor.* 12. 7, 8, 9, 12, 29. I find, *One Spirit, and one way* of *Giving Gifts*, without your diſtinction: but no mention of any ſuch gifts without the *Spirit* by our own Acquiſition. See *Gal.* 3. 1. 2, 3, 5. *Eph.* 3 9. 1 *John* 4. 2, 3.

I would give in many more of my Reaſons, but they lie together in *Gregor. Ariminenſ. in* 2. *ſent. Diſt.* 26. 27, & 28. *Q.* 1. *fol* 84. &c. Who againſt ſome *ſemipelagian* Moderns maintaineth [1. *Quod homo ſecundum præſentem ſtatum, ſtante influentiâ Dei, generali non poteſt per liberum arbitrium, & naturalia ejus, abſq; ſpeciali Dei auxilio agere aliquem actum moraliter bonum.* 2. *Oſtendit aliam partem, fuiſſe de Articulis damnatis Pelagij: aut ſi in aliquo diſcordat, magis deviare à Catholica veritate quam dictum Pelagij* (and yet ſome think verily they are running from *Pelagianiſm*, while they run into this opinion) *& ab hoc ipſam non eſſe ab aliquo Catholico ſuſtinendam.* 3. He ſolveth the arguments brought for the affirmative. And though in defining an act morally good, he ſpeaks as you and I do, yet he fully lets you know that he ſpeaks of the acts of the Reprobate

bate themselves, and such as antecede Justification, or true conversion; and therefore infers hence, *fol.* 85. *quod nemo potest mereri primam gratiam de Condigno, nec etiam de congruo, contra aliquorum sententiam modernorum:*] adding [*nomine autem gratiæ, non solum significo gratiam gratum facientem, sed etiam gratis datam, & universaliter quodcunq; Dei speciale adjutorium ad bene operandum,* &c.] Whereas according to your way of meer Aquisition of a Temporary faith; men may do that which the Papists call *meriting de congruo* the first Grace. Not that he denieth simply that which they call *meritum de congruo,* but that any have it without the *adjutorium speciale* as he cals it, in opposition to the *influentia generalis.* (And his Argument is considerable: *Nemo potest habere ante primam gratiam, actum aliquem liberi arbitrij non culpabilem: igitur nemo de condigno vel de congruo potest mereri primam gratiam: Patet consequentia: quia nullus meretur nisi per actus liberi arbitrij? & certum est quod non per aliquem culpabilem meretur gratiam, sed potius pœnam.*] And *fol.* 85. *col.* 4. He shews that he speaks even of the acts of *Catechumens* and such as are in mortal sin. So that it is not only the Acts that are proper to the Elect that he speaks of. His Arguments are many and weighty, which I shall not recite seeing they lie before you: And he confirms it largely from the consent of the Ancients, *Cyprian, Ambrose, Hierome, Augustine, Damascen, Prosper, Gregory, Isidore,* &c. And confuteth the contrary Reasons with much strength, which *Scotus,* and his friend *Ockam, Adam* and others bring for the contrary, which twelve Reasons contain. I conjecture the chief strength of what can be said for that cause. Many more you know have copiously done the same work: but I refer you to one, for brevity, as speaking most that sticks in my mind against your doctrine of Natural acquisition of the Temporarie faith; which *Ariminensis* thought is *Pelagianism or Worse,* though I intend not so to charge you.

Lastly, I may add, that if you are of the now prevailing opinion, that no Agent natural or free can act without the Pre-determination of God as the first immediate Physical Cause. I cannot see how you can possibly specifie common and special Grace from the manner of Divine production, nor why all

our acts good and bad are not equally by *Infusion*. For though you may change the name, yet that which you call *Infusion* of ſpecial Grace, can do no more then *phyſically, immediately, in ſuperably as the cauſa prima ſimpliciter neceſſaria, determine the will*; and ſo much is ſaid to be done in every act of temporary Faith, yea in every natural, yea in every wicked act. (Though I muſt profeſs my ſelf in this point of the Judgement of *Janſenius*, which the foreſaid *Greg. Ar.* following *Auguſtine*) before him thus expreſſeth, that [*Deus juvat nos ipſum actum immediatè efficiendo, & non ſolum juvat Deus ad bonum partialiter co-efficiendo, quod eſt modus Communis quo concurrit ad cujuſlibet creati agentis quemlibet ſed —— Ad productionem actus mali ſolum primo modo (per influentiam generalem) Deus concurrit; quia non facit voluntatem agere actum malum, ſicut facit eam agere actum bonum.*] But *ad hominem*: this exception is valid againſt any that go on the Pre-determinate grounds.

Let the Jeſuits then call all Temporaries, Graces [*Habitus acquiſitos & ordinis naturalis,*] Let them call this *faith* but [*fidem humanam*] as produced by the power of humane Cauſes] as you ſay; For my part I will not Pelagianize with the Jeſuits; nor can I believe what you further repeat, that [*common Belief is not Divine in reſpect of the Principles from whence it flowes, but generally of an humane deſcent and pedegree.*] I do not think that we are *ſufficient of our ſelves to think* one of theſe good *thoughts of our ſelves*; but that *all our ſufficiency is of God, Who worketh in us both to will and to do*; from *whom cometh every good gift*, even ſuch as the Temporaries. Yet do I not charge [*you or* Suarez, *or the many others*] whoever they be, to be *miſtaken in your Metaphyſicks*: Far be it from me to compare with you there. Only I cannot be of every mans mind that excelleth me in the Metaphyſicks.

Sect. V.

[Second. YOur second Reason is drawn from the nature and proper Acts of both qualities, (*page* 362.) *saving Belief is the first spiritual life, but common Belief no part of it.*] Answer. This Reason seems to be further fetcht then I dare allow of, if you mean by [*The nature of the quality and Acts*] the matter it self. For if the term [*Life*], be Metaphorical here, or it be a Civil or Moral Life that is meant, then I shall allow you, that only special Grace is this special moral Life: but if you should mean a natural *Life*, or a common moral *Life*, I should not grant that all but the Saints are destitute of these. 1. You cannot prove that the term *Life* may not be given to common faith (as goodness is; and as Entity is to Accidents) though that most eminent *species* of Faith, called saving, be also eminently called our Life, for I find in *Jud.* 12. That the Hereticks or Apostates there mentioned, are said to be *twice dead, and plucked up by the roots*, which implyeth, that some kind of life they lost which once they had, and the *seed* that sprung up *by the stony ground and among thorns had a blade* that had some kind of life; and the *branches of Christ* that are *fruitless* yet *wither not*, till they abide *no more in him*, *John* 15.26. The receiving of the Jews into a Church-state again *will be* [*life from the dead*] *Rom.* 11.15 *Ezek.* 16.6. And its called a *Life*, that the backsliding fall from, *Ezek.* 18. and 33.11. But suppose the name of *Life* be improper to give to the Temporary (who wants no doubt the special *Life*.) This proves not a physical specifike difference. And to the Question, [*Why common belief is not this spiritual Life in a less degree?*]

I answ Because it is a matter uncapable of that moral form which is denominated *Life*, your instance of *Calor*, being of meer physical consideration, is alien and impertinent: your instance of *Vertues* is more pertinent. And to that I answer, That though *fortitudo moralis in minori gradu denominat subjectum suum forte*; Yet are there some degrees of the matter, which are incapable of the form and name of fortitude; though

(though in our case, the lower degree is capable of the name of Faith, yet not of the same specifike form, as the higher degree.) Yea some degree of fortitude, overcome by a far greater degree of Cowardize, may not denominate the subject simply *forte*, but only *secundum quid*: nay if the question be simply put, whether that man be *valiant* that alwaies runs away, *&c.* it is simply to be denied, though he may have some small conquered measure of fortitude, because the man is to be denominated from his predominant dispositions, and therefore to be called *Pusillanimous*, and not *valiant*. Temperance, Justice, *&c.* consist in a certain mediocrity of matter, and neither of the extreams are capable of the form: And where somewhat of the form is, it will not serve to dedominate the man against a contrary predominant vice. One man may be so far temperate as to abstain from excess of meat, and not from excess of drink, recreation, *&c.* And another may have so much universal Temperance as shall restrain him for a few daies, and against small Temptations, but yet once or twice a week, a stronger Temptation leadeth him into fornication, gluttony, drunkenness, *&c.* If you ask me whether this be a temperate man, I should say no, but an intemperate: But if you ask me whether there be any degree of Temperance in him, and whether *in tantum*, or *secundum quid*, he be temperate, I should say yea.

The least degree of *Subjection or Obedience* may *in tantum vel secundum quid*, denominate the subject accordingly; but yet such subjection and obedience as is due to a Judge or *Justice of Peace*, denominateth not the person *loyal or subject*, and *Obedient* as is necessary to the *Soveraign Power*. As all *Power of Government* denominateth the Subject *Potent* or a *Governor*. But there is none but a certain degree (even the highest) that will denominate a man a Soveraign or Majestick simply. So I have still acknowledged that the very specifick form and name of saving Faith is not agreeable to that degree which Temporaries have, though a sort of Faith it is, and is called so in Scripture.

The sum of all my discourses on this Subject is but this. To the Essence of saving Faith, *Love, Subjection, &c.* It is necessary

ceſſary. 1. That the Object be apprehended in all its eſſential Reſpects. 2. That the Act be ſo intenſe and ſerious, and ſuitable to this Object (and ſo the habit) as that it may be ſtatedly predominant in the man againſt its contrary. Two ſorts of Faith therefore fall ſhort of being formally this ſaving faith.

1. The one is theirs that do ſeriouſly believe in the ſame Chriſt perſonally conſidered, and in the generall or in moſt *parts of his office*, as we do: but they leave out ſomewhat of the *Object*, that is eſſential to him as the Saviour. *e.g.* They believe in him as God and man, as one that hath undertaken the office of a Redeemer and Mediator, and hath died for ſinners, & in general is the Prieſt, Prophet and King of the Church, and a Juſtifier and Sanctifier, giving Repentance and Remiſſion of ſin; but withall, when it comes to the applicatory conſenting part, they believe not in him as their King, and their Sanctifier by his Word and Spirit, nor as one that ſhall ſave them from their raigning ſin. Now this it not really the Chriſtian faith, or ſaving faith, becauſe it wanteth an eſſential part, it being eſſentially to Chriſt, as the *Saviour offered*, and the object of ſaving faith to be applicatorily [*My Saviour in particular for the pardoning and deſtroying of my ſins.*] Not that we have aſſurance, that he will eventually be ſo to me: but that we our ſelves do conſent that he be ſo to us. As a Phyſitian is not believed in by me (a ſick Patient) as a Phyſitian, unleſs I conſent that he is my *Phyſitian*, and that he cure my *Diſeaſe*, though yet I may poſſibly have doubts of his willingneſs, or of the ſucceſs. As the Act is ſpecified by the Object, ſo theſe Believers have a faith in the ſame Chriſt as we, but *ſecundum quid*, and not *entirely*, and therefore ſimply; They are not Believers in the Chriſtian ſaving ſenſe, or if they believe in Chriſt as God and man that will pardon and ſanctifie, but not as a Sacrifice for ſin; This is not ſimply and fully (taking in all the Eſſentials of his office) the ſame Chriſt that we believe in, and ſo not the ſame Faith. So if they love God as good, but not as the only ſurpaſſing ſuperlative Good, this is not to love him as God and ſo not to love the ſame God as we do.

2. The other ſort of the unſound are ſuch as do apprehend Chriſt under all the ſame conſiderations as ſound Believers do,

and do apprehend God as the chief ſuperlative good, and have ſome anſwerable motions of the Will and Affections : but it is but by a notional ſuperficial, uneffectual apprehenſion ; and hath but an *anſwerable conſent*, and is overtopped and maſtered by a contrary *Habit* and *Action* of the ſoul ; either as the unbelief is more then the *Belief*, and therefore rules the heart and Life, or as the regard to the Creature, is more then the regard to Chriſt (for want of ſo effectual and operative an apprehenſion of his Truth and Goodneſs as we have of the Creature,) and conſequently the Heart is carried out more to the creature then to Chriſt or to the Father. This is not the Chriſtian faith, becauſe it is not an intenſe & ſerious act or habit, ſuch as is fit to denominate the man. He doth not believe or love God heartily *at all* : A Belief and Love indeed he hath, but morally and reputatively it is as *none*, for God will take it as *none*, as to any *ſaving benefit* : for he that hath more *Unbelief* then *Belief*, is not ſimply a *Believer*, but an *Unbeliever* : He that hath more *averſneſs then Love* is ſimply no *Lover* : He that hath more *diſloyalty and Diſobedience then loyalty and obedience*, is not ſimply to be called *Loyal* and *obedient* at all. He that conſidering all things, ſees reaſon to hate his ſin, and hath ſome mind and Will againſt it, and yet hath in other reſpects more mind to it, and more will to keep it then to leave it, is *ſimply impenitent*, and hath no *Repentance*. And yet a real ſubdued motion of Belief, Deſire, Love, Repentance there may be in all theſe perſons, and ſuch as ſometimes in Act will ſeem prevalent, though *Habitually*, and in the courſe of *Action* they are not ſo. As ſin in Act ſeemed prevalent for a time in *David*, when in Habit and the bent of life it was not ſo.

Suppoſe a Souldier take ſuch a man for his general, and obey him ordinarily as a General, and yet being corrupted by the General of the enemies, hath a prevalent Will or Purpoſe to deſert him, betray him, and do him a miſchief when time ſerves. This man is in a ſort a Souldier and obedient, but deſerveth hanging rather then Reward. So much more for explication, and to ſhew you why a common faith is not called by the name of our ſpiritual life (the perſon that hath it, being ſtill under condemnation, and in a ſtate of death :) yea why

why it is not to be called the Christian faith, nor the person a Christian, but Analogically,

---

Sect. VI.

Page 364. TO your third Reason I answer, 1. That I am not of your mind, nor do you prove it, that common Belief is made up but of two principal Ingredients, *Notitia & Assensus*: It hath as many Acts as saving Faith. An Affiance or resting on Christ, and on the Promise with some kind of consent of the Will, may be in this common Faith. [*They stay themselves upon the God of Israel, the Lord of Hoasts*, &c. *Isa.* 48. 2.]

2. I grant that a certain strength may be found in common Faith; but the strongest, greatest firmest, is even in degree below the weakest of a sound Believer. For, 1. As the difference (for ought I yet have heard) is not immediately discernable in the Acts of the Intellect themselves, but in those of the Will, and so of the intellectual Acts by the Will; so the weakest Belief of the sanctified prevaileth with the Will, and overpowreth all resisting Arguments, when the strongest faith of others cannot do it. 2. And though the Grace infused into the Will it self, be a cause of this, yet doubtless the Intellectual Assent is also a cause; And therefore that Assent that *can do more is* surely the stronger. There is a difference even in strength and vigor; where there is so great a difference in the efficacy. What *species* soever it be of, that Light which will shew all visible things, (*suppositis supponendis,*) is a greater Light then that which either shews but greater things, or shews them but dimly. And that heat is greatest which will heat most, (*caeteris paribus.*) The unsanctified would not be so often called the *Children of darkness*, and said to be *blind*, and *in darkness*, and the sound Believers called the *Children of light*, and said to be *in and of the Light*, if we had not a greater light then they.

3. Nor do I believe that the Temporaries [Assent, is proportionable to the mediums that produce it,] (or that in

some such, at leſt produce it.) I think ſuch Believers may have infallible *media*, and the very ſame as produce the ſaving faith of others (not including all cauſes as *media*, but the *objective motives* of our firſt faith.)

4. I grant what you ſay, *pag.* 365. That the loweſt degree of ſaving faith is really our ſpiritual Life, juſtifies. *&c.* which the higheſt degree of common faith doth not.] Becauſe the higheſt degree of common faith either leaves out ſome eſſential part of the object, or is lower and weaker then the loweſt degree of ſaving faith is. And you muſt not take it for granted that it is the Intellectual Acts or Habits only where the difference lies which you expreſs, or the cheif part of that difference. It is the Wills Act, (for ſuch there is *in* faith) that doth moſt or much to this Acceptance, Juſtification, Sanctification, which you mention; which proceeds not only from the difference of Aſſent, but from the Grace which the Will it ſelf alſo hath received.

5. A common knowledge I eaſily grant there is in the unſanctified, ſtronger in its kind then the knowledge of the Saints. That is, Gramatically and Logically they may have a far clearer underſtanding of the ſenſe of words, and of terms of Art, and complex Objects, which are appointed to be the means of knowing the incomplex, and things themſelves (as God, the Redeemer, Heaven, *&c.*) and may be able better to defend any ſacred verity, and expreſs their minds. And this you may call *Acquired knowledge* if you pleaſe, & in ſome ſort ſay it remaineth a diſtinct thing from the other knowledge even in the ſanctified: not but that it ſelf alſo is in them ſanctified & embodied with the reſt of the new Man, but that the knowledge of words and Propoſitions, which is but an Inſtrumental, mediate, ſubſervient part of knowledge is not the ſame with the knowledge of the things themſelves, even God, Chriſt, *&c.* But then I ſtill maintain 1. That Temporary Believers may have more then this meer Diſciplinary knowledge, even a certain illumination of the Spirit Revealing to them Chriſt himſelf, and the powers of the world to come, in ſome Degree, *Heb.* 6. 4. 2 *Pet.* 2 20, &c. ſome inward *taſte* of the matter, as well as a Grammatical, and Logical knowledge of the words, and ſenſe. 2. That as the *Diſciplinary* knowledge of the ſenſe of Propoſitions, in the ſanctifi-

ed

ed and unſanctified do not *quoad materiam* differ by any Phyſical ſpecification, ſo neither dath the *common and ſpecial* illumination or knowledge and taſte of the ſubject matter, or incomplex object.

6. You ſay much in general here, ſounding as if you thought (beyond what your Theſis requireth you to prove) that there were a Phyſical ſpecifick Difference in the matter. Becauſe you do not plainly aſſert it, I will ſuppoſe it not to be your meaning: But if really it be ſo, and God ſhall direct you to any more of this work, I earneſtly intreat you above all the reſt of your undertaking to tell us plainly *what the Phyſical Forms are that ſpecifie and denominate theſe ſeveral ſorts of Knowledge, Faith, Love, Deſire,* &c. That there is a *moral* ſpecifick Difference we are agreed: If you aſſert a *Phyſical*, plainly deſcribe and denominate each Form, (for I doubt not but we are agreed that a Form there muſt be thus to ſpecifie and denominate.) I find *Ameſius* (*Aſſertion Theolog. de lum. Nat. & Grat.*) Diſclaiming a difference as to the Object, ſubject, or *lumen deferens & deducens objectum*, &c. as he cals the *medium*; limiting the Controverſie to the [*Lumen diſponens & elevans ſubjectum: ut recipiat*] which he maintaineth muſt be ſupernatural, and ſo do I: but withall I maintain that ſomewhat of the ſupernatural Light is given to many of the unſanctified. And whereas he ſaith that one ſort of knowledge is Diſciplinary ſuch as a blind man (born) hath of Light, and the other is *Intuitive*; *ex repreſenti & ſenſim percepta*: 1. I am not convinced that any man in this life, doth intuitively or ſenſibly know God, or the Lord Jeſus Chriſt God and man; or the inviſible Glory, or Relative Benefits, ſuch as pardon, Juſtification, Adoption, *&c.* And I am confident I have your conſent. 2. And for the Hiſtory or any Enunciation of the Scripture, which muſt be underſtood by a Grammatical and Logical knowledge, we are agreed. 3. It is nothing therefore in all the world, that I remember, that can fall into Controverſie about this *Intuitive knowledge*, but the inward paſſions or actions of our own ſoul's. That the ſoul doth know its own knowledge and Volition intuitively, is the opinion of ſome Schoolmen, and oppoſed by others. Upon which account perhaps thoſe of the firſt ſort, may alſo

say, that a sanctified person may *Intuitively* see the sincerity or holy nature of his own knowledge. But 1. if that were so and a common thing, me thinks doubting of sincerity should not be so common with such. 2. Our affections and Wills are thought by many to be more properly said to be *felt*, then *intuitively* known. 3. It is certain that the first act of saving faith can be no such thing as this: for a man must, at least in order of Nature, first *have* a saving faith, before he can *intuitively* see it in himself. 4. And this is nothing to our business: for it is not our own faith or love, or other inherent Graces, that is the Object of our saving Faith; but it is God the Father, Son and Holy Ghost, and the Promise, *&c.* which are not known by us *intuitively* or *sensibly*. (Though the Letter of the Promise is, yet the sense is not; much less the Truth.) Yet I make no doubt but a true Believer being once justified by faith, hath sometimes after such Peace with God, & shedding abroad of his Love in the heart, as gives him (not an *intuitive* or *sensible* knowledge of God himself immediatly, but) a lively Relish and feeling of those precious fruits and tokens of his Love, which may be called an experimental knowledge that God is, and that he is gracious, faithful, *&c.* Seeing him more clearly in this Glass of his Image on our own souls, then in our first faith we saw him in the meer extrinsick Glass of the Gospel, Works, *&c.* though in both the Spirit causeth the apprehension. 5. And if this were any thing to us, yet some inward tasts the unsanctified do attain. So that I cannot yet reach to understand, that between the Knowledge, Assent, *&c.* of the sanctified, and the highest Temporaries, there is Physically any specifick Difference, but only morally: but a very great gradual difference also Physically.

Your Similitude of the Light of the Sun and Moon, proves not that the matter of common and proper faith are *specifically-physically* different, and then (whatever you intend it for) its not against me. It is the same Spirit that illuminateth both sorts; but the Sun and Moon are not the same Illuminating luminaries: Nor is it a thing fully agreed on, whether the Light of the Sun and Moon are specifically distinct; nor of the Heat of the Sun and of fire. Saith *Ockam*, *Quod. lib.* 3 *q.* 21. *fol.* 48.

*fol.*48. [*Effectus diverſi ejuſdem ſpeciei, poſſunt eſſe à Cauſis diverſarum ſpecierum, licèt non idem effectus: patet de calore, qui poteſt eſſe ab igne & à ſole.*] His Application ſomewhat concerneth our Cauſe, [*Ita eſt in propoſito: Primus actus poteſt cauſari ab objecto ſine habitu; & alius actus ejuſdem ſpecie, non poteſt cauſari niſi ab habitu.*] (Therefore you cannot thence prove a ſpecifick Difference of the Acts, that one is from a gracious Habit, and the other not.)

Page 367. You add, that [*Common faith is not any diſpoſition, moral or Evangelical, whereby the ſubject that hath it, is or can be diſpoſed (in the way we now ſpeak of) for the introduction of the Habit of ſaving Faith.*]

Anſw. [*The way you now ſpeak of*] Are words that refer to ſo many or uncertain paſſages, that thence I will conclude, that you mean ſome way which we diſown as well as you, though I fully know not what you mean. But that common Grace is preparatory to ſpecial, is ſo commonly held by Proteſtants, (eſpecially practical Divines) and ſo plain in Scripture and Reaſon, that I ſhall not trouble you with many words about it. 1. He that uſeth Gods appointed means as well as he can, is more diſpoſed for the bleſſing of thoſe means, then the wilfull deſpiſer or neglecter of them. 2. He that is *neerer Chriſt* is more diſpoſed to come to him by faith, then he that is at a further diſtance. 3. He that doth not ſo much reſiſt the Spirit, but with ſome ſeriouſneſs beggeth for the Spirit and for ſaving Grace is better diſpoſed for it, then ſuch as obſtinatly reſiſt or ſcorn it.

Your firſt Argument is, from our *Death in ſin: the dead are undiſpoſed*: I anſwer, *As dead* they are ſo: But 1. It is ſuch a *Death* as hath a *Natural Life*, and Reaſonable ſoul, and moral Vertues and common Graces conjoined: and by theſe the dead may be Diſpoſed, though not by death, nor as dead: Allow your *ſimile* its *diſſimilitudes*. 2. A condemned Traytor thats dead in Law, may by humble ſupplication do ſomewhat to diſpoſe himſelf for pardon, and Life: though I know our caſe requireth much more. As I ſaid, God would not have appointed any means for an unregenerate man to uſe in order to his Converſion, if the uſe of them did no whit diſpoſe us be converted.

verted. I say the more of this, because I am greatly troubled with two sorts of people in my own Parish that are harping on this string, [*We cannot give Grace to our selves, nor be saved without it; nor can We have it till God give it us: which if he will do, we shall be saved: if he will not, all that we can do will not help it.*) This is the main objection that Satan hath furnished 1. some Apostate Heathens, that speak it in design. 2. And many of the ignorant and prophane that thus are setled in a neglect and contempt of the means of Grace: Its as good say we lie dead in our pleasures till God will give us Life, as lie dead in Prayers and Hearing Sermons, and forbearing our Delights; for we can do nothing to the quickening of our selves.

Your second Reason is, [*That our new birth is a new Creation, which is ex materia indisposita.*] *Answ.* It is a new creation ordinarily *in materia disposita*: *Adams* soul was created in a Disposed or prepared Body. The Rational soul is created in the *Embrio* in the womb, in a disposed body, yea many Philosophers would perswade us, not only in a body that hath first a vegetative, but a sensitive soul. Sure I am God can appoint men a course of means in which they shall wait for his New Creation, and ordinarily bless his own means, and make a lesser blessing a Disposition to a greater, though all this be little to our first Controversie. For when I call the common faith [*a Disposition*] I talk not of Dispositions preparatory to further Grace.

To your third Reason I answer, 1. Some common Grace is as solely and wholly a gracious and supernatural work, as saving Grace: yet men may have a Dispositon to that, therefore to this. 2. The highest Grace of the unregenerate is very ill supposed by you to be but a [*natural or artificial product of our understandings.*] A lower supernatural Grace may be a Disposition towards a higher supernatural Grace. Mans corrupted heart seems too much exalted by you, while you call him *Dead*, and yet think he can Acquire the highest Graces of Temporary Believers, without supernatural Grace. Why then do you call it common [*Grace.*] You know who taught men to call nature by the name of Grace.

In

In your fourth Reason, you run again on the same supposition, that [*our own understandings helped by education, learning and industry, can acquire common faith.*] Even the highest of the Temporary (which you must mean, or you say nothing,) Against which I again refer you to the foresaid Disputation of *Arminensis*, who thinks he proves this *Pelagianism*, or worse. It is not only saving Grace that is infused. 2. Infused supernatural common Grace is no more of our selves, then infused supernatural special Grace. 3. To say that Gods common Grace disposeth us for special Grace, is no more to say that [*it is of our selves*] then it is, if we say that a less Degree of special Grace disposeth us to a greater Degree (Though in other respects the cases differ.) Do you as fully agree with *Paul*, 2 *Cor.* 3. 5. that [*we are not sufficient of our selves to think any thing as of our selves, but our sufficiency is of God*, and *Phil*, 2. 13. *That it is God that worketh in us both to will and to do*] with the rest before cited, and then we shall not differ in this. For I easily believe that faith and saving Grace is not of our selves, but the gift of God.

To your fifth I say, I am of your mind, that [*Faith is not promised us on any precedent condition*, &c.] The *Arminians* think otherwise. Your Consequent taken of moral specification, I still grant: but taken of Physical, seems to go into the contrary extream. There are certainly Dispositions, where there are no Covenant-Conditions. See what of this I have said out of *Chemnitius* in answer to Mr. *Tombes Animadversions*, in the Disputation of *Justification*, if you see cause.

To your sixth I say, 1. That no carnal man, or temporary, so pleaseth God, as that the person is accepted into Son-ship or Reconciliation; or the action be *ex pacto, rewardable*, (at least with any eternal Reward) Though some think that [*Giving a cup of cold water to a Disciple in the name of a Disciple*, may be done by a *Temporary* that would not suffer much for Christ; yet I cannot say that the Text is not to be expounded of such a giving, as comes from saving Love to Christ.) But yet *secundum quid* or *in tantum*: A man unregenerate may do that which is so far pleasing to God, as that he will oft-times and ordinarily deal the better with him in outward Respects, and

deal the better with him for his soul. If God bid him Read, Hear, Pray, Consider, or enquire of Ministers, as he bid *Cornelius* send for *Peter*, or bid them search the Scripture daily, *&c.* he is better pleased that men do thus use his means, then that they despise or neglect them; and in this way he usually gives his Grace. And those that have the best common Disposition, he usually takes as most prepared for saving Grace. Our *Hooker*, *John Rogers*, and other Preachers ordinarily thought so, when they preacht so much for preparatory works to Conversion: naming Humiliation, Desire, some Hope, *&c.* I leave you to expound that, *Acts* 17.11,12. [*These* (*Berean* Jews) *were more NOBLE then those in* Thessalonica, *in that they received the Word with all readiness of mind, and searched the Scriptures daily whether these things were so: THEREFORE many of them Believed.*] Though *Calvin* thinks that it was not the searchers but others because of them, that are said [*therefore to Believe*] (which seems not the most likely sence.) Yet he thinks that [*hic primus est ad fidem ingressus, ut prorupti simus ad sequendum, & abdicato proprio carni sensu dociles nos Christo & morigeros præbeamus.*] And how many Volumes had been written against me if I had said but as *Calvin* (*ibid. in Act* 17.12. [*Non spernenda est hæc virtus sedulitas, ad*) *quam intentos fuisse prædicat Lucas fideles in fidei sue confirmationem; multi enim qui principio ebulliunt, statim se ignaviæ dedentes, dum nulla profectus cura tanguntur, qualecunq; fidei semen perdunt.*] So that *Calvin* thought common Grace was such a Preparation or Disposition, as might be called [*a Seed of Faith.*] But it were an endless task to cite all Protestants that write for this Preparatory Grace.

2. I further answer, that carnal men may have much in them that is not carnal even the common graces of the Spirit, and these are not enmity to God, though the carnal mind be; nor is God an enemy to them.

To your seventh I answer. 1. That though not Hypocrites as such, or Devils be prepared for Grace, yet such as [*begin in the Spirit*] and have the highest graces that the unsanctified may have, are so far disposed for more, as that they do much more ordinarily receive saving Grace, then others do.

But

But you say, [*If the Gospel is true, Its evidently otherwise, and generally those have been converted to Christianity which had not such measures of Knowledge and common Graces: When those have not which had, as the* Pharisees, *&c.* Answer, That the Gospel is true, I hope we are agreed: though we are too much unacquainted our selves with the nature of our own faith by which we do believe it. And yet I am confidently perswaded that my Assertion here is truer then yours, unless (as its like) by this common Grace, you still mean another thing then I do. I do not think that *Aristotle* or *Galen*, or the *Scribes* or *Pharisees* had much of the common Grace that I speak of, much less the highest measure. That is not the highest and most dispositive common Grace, which consisteth in Arts or disciplinary knowledge, in being acquainted with the Letters and Words, and Propositions of the Law; much less where it is joined with proud self-conceitedness, and presumption and self-delusion, being settled (by the mistaking of their parts and formalities for true godliness,!) in a conceit that they are already sanctified, and so becom the most negligent of all others in making out to Christ for Sanctification: The men that I speak of that have a dispositive common Grace are other kind of folks then you seem to talk of. They are such as are as far abased in the feeling of their sin and misery, and humbled by Attrition, (as the Papists call it) and cry out of their sin and folly, and day and night do beg for Grace and Mercy; As common Grace will carry them to do. And far it will carry them. And they are such as like the word and waies of God, and think his servants the best and happiest men, and have many a wish that they were such themselves, and that avoid as much of gross and wilfull sinning, and continue as much in hearing reading the word, enquiring consideration, as common Grace may bring them to do, and they are such as have as much belief of the Gospel, and as much desire after Christ and holiness, and heaven, and as much love to God and the Redeemer, and the Saints, as common grace can lead them to. And withall, that have either a knowledge that yet they are short of true Christianity, or at left, are much afraid of it, (which no doubt but common Grace may bring

them to.) And therefore are under a prudent Impatiency till saving Grace come in, and the Spirit have sealed them up to the day of Redemption, and are crying out, *What shall we do to be saved?* These are they that I speak of, and not proud *Pharisees* or unsanctified Philosophers, or learned self-esteeming men, that make themselves believe, that they have infused special Grace, because they can talk of it: And that are further from Christ in the capital sins of heart rebellion, Pride, vain-glory, Hypocrisie, Worldliness, if not sensuality, then most other men. Its none of these men for all their Arts, Sciences, Languages, *&c.* That I suppose to have the highest common Grace. Your Instances therefore are not to the purpose and your conclusion, *p.* 373. is either impertinent or very unsound.

I know that the conceit that common Grace is saving, may make the condition of such persons more dangerous, then of some scandalous sinners that are easilyer convinced. But, 1. Those persons that are so conceited, are far from the height of common Grace, as *Pharisees* are commonly inwardly more wicked then many of the scandalous. 2. And it is not the common Grace, but the mis-conceit for want of more that is the cause of the danger of such men. Even special Grace it self may be abused: For though *Austin* and the Schoolmen put it in their definition, that it is such [*quâ nemo malè utitur*,] yet that must be meant *efficiently* and not *objectively*: For I think a man may be proud of his Grace, and so objectively misuse it: much more may common Grace be misused; and yet it proves it not to be no Disposition to special Grace.

The *Canon. 6. Concil i Arausicani*, which you cite, is at least as fully consented to by me as by you, *viz.* [*That those that think that Mercy is given to men that without the Grace of God do believe, Will, desire and knock; & confesseth not that it is given us from God by the infusion and inspiration of the holy Ghost in us, to believe, will, and be able to do all these things as we ought*, &c. *resist the Apostle.*] But I will desire you to consider what the same council saith of the opinion, which you seem to propugn before you go on in it. The next *Can. 7.* saith, [*Si quis per naturæ vigorem bonum aliquod quod ad salutem pertinet vitæ æternæ*, &c. *Hæretico fallitur spiritu, non intelligens*

vocem

vocem Dei in Evangelio dicentis, ſine me nihil poteſtis facere : & illud Apoſtoli, Non quod idonei ſumus cogitare aliquid a nobis, &c.] And *Canon.* 22. *Nemo habet de ſuo niſi mendacium & peccatum. Siquis autem homo habet veritatem atq; juſtitiam, ab illo fonte eſt, quem debemus ſitire*, &c.] And *Can.* 16. *Nemo ex eo quod videtur habere glorietur, tanquam non acceperit, aut ideo ſe putet accepiſſe, quia litera extrinſecus velut legitur, apparuit*, &c.] *Can.* 3. *Siquis per invocationem humanam gratia Dei dicit poſſe conferri, non autem ipſam gratiam facere ut invocetur à nobis, contradicit Apoſtolo*, &c.] If therefore the common Grace in queſtion, be *bonum aliquod quod ad ſalutem pertinet*, or if it be but *aliquid cogitare*, or if it may be called invocation for Grace or be better then *mendacium & peccatum*. This Councill thought it Pelagianiſm to aſcribe it to our meer Naturals without Grace. This you obſerve, *pag* 375. But ſo that you would limit diſpoſitive or preparing Grace, to that which the Schoolmen call *preventing Grace*, even ſaving faith with love : but (as ſometime they call all that preventing Grace that goes before Juſtification and merit of congruity, as they call it ſo.) *Arminenſis ubi ſupra*, hath fully proved that they with the Fathers aſcribe much of that Grace that is found in the unjuſtified to the ſpecial Grace of God , (as ſpecial is diſtinct from general influence.) And therefore take heed leſt while *pag.*376. you would bring the opinion which you argue againſt, under the ſuſpicion of Pelagianiſm, *&c.* You run not into the ſame : (Whcih yet I intend not to charge you with.) *Caranza* thinks, the *Councill Aranſ.* ſpeaks only of ſpecial ſaving Grace as out of mans power ; but he confeſſeth that many Moderns think otherwiſe.

For my part, though all this new Controverſie of diſpoſitive Grace do little concern that which I aſſerted, which you undertook to oppoſe, yet the Reaſons which I gave here in the beginning of this Queſtion, with the concurrent Judgement of Proteſtant Divines, and above all, the plain and frequent paſſages of Scripture do ſatisfie me, that common Grace is truly preparative and diſpoſitive to ſaving Grace ; not as one degree of the ſame *ſpecies in morality* diſpoſeth to another

degree, (for this we are agreed against.) But, 1. As it is a less unpreparedness and undispositedness then a worse estate. 2. As it removeth many and great Impediments. 3. As it is a use of the means appointed by God for obtaining his saving Grace. 4. As it is *in tantum* or *secundum quid* a thing pleasing to God and loved by him yea, & as he loveth such as have it more then those that are without it, with the love of Complacencie and Acceptation, so as it is a state much nearer Christ then other mens of obstinate wickedness are in; in these five respects I think it prepareth & disposeth to saving grace. Though I think not that this same common Grace is the very thing that it turned by any Improvement of ours, or elevation of the Spirit into saving Grace. But this much I am satisfied of. (between the Arminian & the contrary extream) 1. That God hath not entered into Covenant or Promise with any unregenerate man to give him saving Grace upon any condition to be performed without it. 2. But yet that he hath commanded him to use certain means to obtain it, and to avoid the resistance and hindrances. 3. And that a very Command to use such means as means, is a strongly incouraging intimation, that God will not deny men the end and blessing, that use the means as well as they can. For it is certain, that he appointeth no means in vain. 4. That unsanctified men may do less evil and more good then they do, and particularly in the use of those means. 5. And that they have so much encouragement, (though no Promise) to the use of those means, that they are left unexcusable (not only as originally disabled, but) as wilfully graceless, and even at the Bar of Grace (or the Redeemer,) if they neglect them 6. And that no man can stand out, and say, I did the best that ever I could to obtain saving Grace, and yet went without it becaus God would not give it me. This much I am satisfied of, as to preparatory Grace.

And yet my Controversies with the late Reverend Servant of Christ, Mr. *Blake* and others, do tell me to my trouble, that some Protestants that are no *Arminians*, go so much further in this then I; then they would have it a principal use of Baptism, the Lords Supper, &c. to receive these men of com-

mon

mon grace (though they seem not to have more, or say some, profess no more) and advance them to Saving Grace. And that it is the first visible Church state according to Divine institution, by which men must pass into the invisible Church of the sanctified. But I see I shall have your vote against this way.

But yet really I should think (if I were of your opinion about Baptism, if Mr. *Tombes* Letter be yours,) that men should ordinarily be a while *Catechumens* before they are Baptized: And according to the Opinion I am of (for Infant Baptism) if I were (as the Ancient Churches were) among Heathens, where a principal part of the Baptized must be adult, (though I would not needlesly delay a through Convert, yet) I should think that commonly the state of *Catechumens* must be a Preparatory state; and that the *Catechumens* were to be supposed in a more disposed state, then most that stood at greater distance.

I do verily think that a man of the Highest knowledge and Belief of sin and misery, Christ and Mercy, God and Glory, that common grace can reach to, with the highest Love, Desires, Humiliation, Fear, Confession, Petition, Obedience that common grace can reach to, is in all the five Respects forementioned, more Disposed for Saving Grace, and Prepared, then one that is an Apostate, or under the sin against the Holy Ghost, or unto Duty, or one that heareth and hateth the Minister and the Word, or that so hateth that he will not hear: and that persecuteth godliness out of hatred to it, and liveth in wilfull Drunkenness, Murder, Whoredom, *&c.* I know not what men may seem out of their own Principles, and some misinterpreted Texts, but sure I am I find in experience such an exceeding difference between the success of my Labours on the more humble considerate, teachable sort of people, that are not drown'd in wilful wickedness and sensuality with the worst: and the old self-conceited, ignorant persons, and the proud and haughty Spirits, and old drunkards, and such like rooted sensualists, that there is no comparison to be made: and I am fully satisfied to perswade Thieves, Adulterers, Drunkards, Scorners at godliness, Neglecters and despisers of means,

and

and professed Infidels, rather to come out of these sins, and use the means, ann believe the Scripture to be true, though but with a Dogmatical Faith, then to contiue as they are. And I shall take such Believers, and Reformers, to be more prepared and Disposed for Saving Grace, then they were before. And I hope this is no Heresie.

Sure I am that *Agrippa* that was almost perswaded to be a Christian, was neerer it and better disposed then the haters of Christianity. And I am sure that Christ was well able to resolve our Controversie, and that he told the *Scribe*, *Mark* 12. 34. *Thou art not far from the Kingdom of God*:] acquainting us that there is a state thats neer and next to the state of Grace, when other men are further off. And as sure I am that he that said, [*All this I have observed from my youth*] was *Loved* by Christ, and told *that he yet lacked one thing*. *Mark*. 10.21. and that this is a better dispositon to Grace, then they that are not so much *loved*, are in, and *that lack more things*: Though yet even such *may go away sorrowful*, through the *powerful temptation of Riches*, Luke 1. 17. It was the work of *John to make ready a people prepared for the Lord*.] And if such were not more undisposed to receive true Grace, we should not so oft have heard that threatning, *Mark*.4.12. *Acts* 28.27. [*The heart of this people are waxed gross, and their ears are dull of hearing, and their eyes have they closed, lest they should see with their eyes, and hear with their ears, and understand with their heart, and should be converted, and I should heal them.*] This was not the state of all the unconverted. *Tyre and Sydon* were not so undisposed for Grace, as *Capernaum* was. But enough of this, unless I were sure that there were any real difference between us. I speak but to your words, as they may be interpreted by any Readers, to oppose the Truths which I assert, imagining that your self intend it not, however you might mistake me.

To your fourth Reason *pag*.376. I *answer*, 1. We are Agreed still of the Conclusion.

2. But I still think you are very much out, in taking the highest common Grace to be but such as the knowledge of Tongues, *&c.* which you there mention, and to be but [*the product*

product of our natural understandings, advanced by education and Industry, now since Miracles are ceased.] For though Education and industry be a means to common and special Grace, yet without the help and Gift of the Spirit, men can have neither special Grace, nor that common grace which I speak of. I much fear left many Learned, Civil, Orthodox men, do take common grace to be special, and so delude their own souls, in the trial of themselves. Mr. *Shepheard* hath told you from many Scriptures (in your Book) of higher things then these you mention, that Hypocrites or Temporaries may attain. And all that they had from the Spirit in the Primitive times, was not only the power of Miracles, as is shewed: therefore they may have more from the Spirit now.

3. I do not think your Consequence good, that the loosing of one, and not loosening, or not loosableness, of the other, will prove a specifick difference. For 1. There are many common gifts in man that are no more loseable then saving Grace. 2. And on the other side, it is not from the meer Nature of inherent Grace that it cannot be lost; but from the Divine Decree, Love and engagement (of which I have spoken in a Discourse of Perseverance,) For *Adam* had saving Grace, even the Image of God, and yet lost it: yet I believe the Apostle, that it is because the seed of God remaineth in us; but I think it is not a good Argument, that because it is the seed, or such a Seed, therefore it will remain: but it Remaineth in us, because the Love of God in Christ, and the operation of the Spirit causeth it to Remain. For *Adam* had a Seed of the same Nature, and yet it did not Remain in him.

Sect. VII.

Page 380. TO your fifth Reason, 1. I grant both your Conclusion still, and that *Habits* are distinguished specifically when the formal Objects are so distinct. 2. And I am of the same mind with *Rob. Baronius*; as you cite him; that no man but the Regenerate is truly a Divine or Christian, and hath properly Theologie, but only Analogically: Though perhaps I may have censures enough for coming so neer to you in this, for all you think me to differ so much from you. It is but the same thing that *Disput.* 5. *of Right to Sacraments* I maintained. 3. But I am not yet satisfied that saving faith believes many things or any thing materially, which a common faith doth not believe in his manner, of which more anon.

4. That which is the formal Object of the Act of Faith, is it you say, specifieth the Habit: and therefore you afterward describe it as respecting the Act. But it is not all the *Motives and Media* that are the *formal* objects of the act of Faith; but it is the *Veracity of the Revealer*, or Speaker, or Testifier. He that believeth the same material Truths because of the Veracity of God the Revealer, hath a true Divine faith; though in regard of the Motives or Media by which men discern or are perswaded, that the Revelation is indeed Divine, there may be differences between several true Believers, and some of them may make use of insufficient or mistaken mediums or motives. If you deny this, you will leave but few Christians among Christians, and perhaps not any of the ignorant sort; nay perhaps not one at all in the world, as to their first Act of Faith, if your following grounds be annexed. For my part, if I see a poor Christian that believeth all the Articles of the faith, because God hath Revealed them, who he is fully perswaded cannot lie, to be yet at a loss as to the *Media* or *Motives* that should perswade him to take the Scripture to be a Divine Revelation; or if he Receive this but on insufficient grounds or Receive the Articles of Faith by Tradition without Scripture and yet give up himself hereupon to the Obedience of the Doctrine which he receiveth, I shall take him to be a Believer or Christian indeed.

deed. Many thousands believe the Doctrine of Scripture upon Gods credit, and therefore with a Divine Faith, that are not able to give you such proofs of the Revelation being Divine, as the cause requires or deserves.

5. The Divine Veracity is so far known by men, as they know indeed that there is a God: For a lying god is not God, but an Idol. And so far as common grace may lead men from Atheism, so far it may lead them to believe upon the credit of God, or to acknowledge Gods Veracity, and so to Believe the Gospel *fide Divinâ*, when they once take the Gospel to be the Word of God. So that the faith of Temporaries may have the same *objectum formale*, as the faith of Saints: that is, the Veracity of God: And the *Media* to prove the Revelation Divine, are not the formal object of faith; though the Revelation be of necessity, as *a Condition sine quanon*, to the act of Faith, as *Promulgation of a Law* is to the *Act of Obedience*. Of this I have spoken more largely in the *Preface* to *part.2. of the Saints Rest.*

6. Where you say *pag.*381. [*That saving Faith is built on better Principles, as proceeding from the Spirit of Christ and being built upon his immediate Revelation and Testimony*, &c.] I *Answer*, I doubt I differ from you more in this, then in the Conclusion. I have in the first and second part of my *Treat. against Infidelity*, specially, *pag.*82. *part.* 2. § 2. and through that part purposely shewed how much I ascribe to the Spirits Testimony in our Belief. As also in the *Saints Rest*, *part.*2. *pag.* 197. (Impression 7.) *c.*2. § 1. and in the *Preface* to that part: and its fully and Judiciously handled by the *Amyrald* in *Thes. Salm. Vol.* 1. *pag.* 122. *Thes. de Testimon. Spirit.* And by *Rob. Baronius in Apodix. ad Turnbull. pag.*733. I readily yield that the illumination of the Spirit is necessary, and that when once men have Received the impress of the Word, and the Image of God by the Spirit on their hearts, they have then in themselves a *Medium* whence they may conclude that Scripture is the Word of God. But your plain Doctrine is [*that common Belief hath only an uncertain fallible Medium, and all saving faith hath a certain infallible Medium, and that is the Testimony* (*immediate*) *of the Spirit within us.* Now 1. Here

I may well take it for granted that by this Testimony, you mean not the Spirit as a meer efficient cause, giving us the Rectified power of Believing, or the Habit, or exciting and educing the Act, as a Pre-determining, or other efficient cause: For as we all confess this Medicinal Grace and efficient illumination as well as you; So this is none of the Controversie, nor the thing that you express. Its one thing to give us eyes and Sight and to cure their diseases, and set open the windows, and another thing to propose an Object, or to see in our stead. We confess that the Holy Ghost gives us the moral power or Habit, and educeth the Act, and so efficiently causeth us to see, and that sufficient Objects and Reasons for Believing are laid before all men that have but a sufficient internal Sight. But your Testimony which is made the *Medium*, must needs be supposed to be an *objective Medium or Evidence*, or an *internal Affirmation or Enunciation*, as by another within us as saying [*This is the Word of God, or this is true*] by way of full Testimony, not only opening the eyes to see the evidence already extant in the Word, *&c.* but also being it self the evidence, as a full inartificial Argument, and as an inward witness that is to be believed himself, and not only causeth us to believe a former word. Now that besides all the efficient illumination that causeth us to believe the Divine Testimony or Enunciations already extant in the Word, there is no such inward word of the Spirit objectively necessary as the *Medium* of our Belief to the Being of Saving Faith, and to prove its Specifick difference; besides what is said; I briefly add, these few Reasons, 1. This Doctrine is Papall or worse, making the Word of God insufficient *in suo genere*, to the use it is ordained for. I know that in other kind of Causality, it is no disparagement to the Scripture, to say that it is not sufficient: but it is sufficient in its own kind; which is to contein the matter of our Faith, and objective Testimony of God thereto. And though we yield that the Transcript or effect of this word on the heart is objectively useful, as well as efficiently, to confirm us in the Faith as a secondary Testimony, yet it is not the prime Testimony, nor Necessary to supply any defect in it: nor is Scripture in that kind insufficient without it, to afford us a valid *Medium* for Belief:

Many

many Papists, (of whom *Baronius* against *Turnbullus* treats at large) do indeed suppose such an inspiration or immediate Testimony necessary in the Pope or Church to ascertain us that the Scripture is the word of God: but we are not of that mind.

2. If the *objective medium* be uttered by a voice as it were, or any thing answerable within us, either it is *aliunde*, fetcht and receited from without, that is, from Scripture, or it is primarily from the inward Testifier, If the first, then the *scripture Medium* is sufficient, for it is the same receited within; and so the common and saving faith have the same *Medium*. If the later, then it is meer *Inspiration prophetical*, and so, 1. None should be Christians or saved but Prophets, which is *Enthusiasm*, and more. 2. And the ordinary way of mens Conversion should be without the word, or the word be unnecessary to it. For what need another tell me that by a fallible way, which the Spirit within doth primarily utter by an infallible Testimony.

3. The holy Scripture is the *medium* of the common Believer, (as Gods veracity is his formal object.) But the holy Scripture is no uncertain, humane, fallible *Medium*, as you say the Temporaries is.

4. Your Doctrine, (as your words import,) doth excuse all Infidels before God as guiltless: For if there be not propounded to them in Scripture, nor any other way, a certain Divine, infallible objective *Medium* of Belief; then cannot they be obliged to believe. For to believe without a necessary Object is naturally impossible. And though moral Impotency, which is but their viciousness, do not excuse, yet natural Impotency at least, not caused by sin, doth excuse. That their understandings are so blind, as to have need of the Illumination of the Spirit, to enlighten them to see a sufficient *Object* or *Medium* of Belief, this is there own fault, But that they cannot see or believe without a certain *Medium* or object, this is no more their fault, then it is that they see not non-existents, or that which is a thousand miles of, or that they cannot see it in the dark.

5. According to your Doctrine, most of the Christians in the

world, and all that I know (as far as I can learn) must be unchristened, and cast into a state of Condemnation. For though I know many that have such a Testimony of the Spirit as I have described in my Treat. against Infidelity, *Part* 2. Yet I never knew one that had any other, that is, that had an immediate word uttered by the Spirit within him, distinct from Scripture, which his first faith was resolved into, as the *Medium* that must specifie it. At last, it is a terrible Doctrine, to put poor Christians on the rack, so by that, few will ever know that they have faith, if they must prove it specified by a Prophetick Revelation. And if you make any difference between this, and the Revelation of the Prophets, let us know wherein the difference lieth.

6. The undoubted fruit of this Doctrine received, would be the inflation of audacious, fiery, fantastick spirited men, that are ready to think that all strong impulses within them are of the Spirit of God, as poor humble Christians that feel no such thing, must fall into despair, for as they feel it not, so they know not how to come to the feeling of it.

7. If this inward Testimony be the certain *Medium* of knowing the Scripture to be the word of God, then either all the Scripture or but part: If but part, which part, and why one part rather then another? If all, whence is it that never any of the millions of Christians have from this inward Testimony taught us which Books be canonical, and which not: but all go for that to other Testimonies or *Media*.

8. If we have *infallible certain Media*, to prove the Scripture to be the true word of God without any internal *Medium* as necessary, (supposing the efficient Illumination of our minds by the Spirit to see the *Media* already extant) then the supposed *Medium* of the Spirits *immediate Testimony*, is not of necessity to saving Faith. But that the Antecedent is true, is manifest thus: we can without that inward *Word* or *Medium*, shew sufficient proof. 1. That all that God saith is true. 2. And that the Scripture is his word. And 3. Consequently that all in Scripture is true. *Ergo*. &c. 1. That God is *verax*, and cannot lie, is as easie to prove, as that he is God. 2. That the Scripture is his word, is proved by certain Arguments, by

En-

Euſebius, *Auguſtine*, and many other Fathers, by *Ficinus*, *Vives*, *Dupleſſis*, *Grotius*, *Davenport*, *Garbut*, *Camero*, *Polanus*, and an hundred more. Yet ſtill we maintain. 1. That a natural Light is neceſſary to ſuch a belief of this, as the meer natural man may reach. 2. A common Illumination is neceſſary to the higher apprehenſions, and faith of the temporary. 3. And a ſpecial Illumination is neceſſary to ſaving Belief.

9. If we are in doubt of an inward word of Teſtimony, whether it be from the Spirit of God or not, how ſhall we know but by trying the Spirits, and how ſhall we trie them, but by the Word? The word therefore is a ſufficient *Medium*, (though not ſufficient to enlighten us to diſcern it.)

10. The *medium* that is an inward objective Teſtimony, muſt be ſome word, or ſome work of the Spirit on the ſoul, A word diſtinct from a work: the common experience of Believers doth deny, or not know, ſuch a work, that is the objective motive, muſt be in order before the Faith that is cauſed by it: But before the firſt Act of ſaving Faith, there is no ſuch experience or objective motive or *Medium* in the ſoul: therefore the firſt act of ſaving Faith is not thus ſpecified: and therefore it is not neceſſary to the ſpecification. Yea, and thus there ſhould no man ever be bound to believe, becauſe he muſt have that inward experiment, Word, *Medium*, or Motive extant in him, before he firſt believe (if this were neceſſary as is ſaid) and yet its certain that no man hath that experiment, *Medium*, *&c.* till he do believe: for Infidels have it not.

I confeſs that a ſanctified man hath an inward Principle and Habit, which others have not, and that for confirmation after his firſt belief, the experience of that may be a ſubſervient *Medium*. But I know not of any one Article of Faith, or any *Medium* objective for the diſcerning of that Truth, which is neceſſary to a ſaving Faith, which Temporaries have not ſome knowledge of. They know all the ſame Articles of faith, and believed them by the ſame *Media*, though not by the ſame illuminated, ſanctified minds, and not with a faith of the ſame ſpecies *faith* Pemble *truly*, (vindic. Grat. pag. 215.) *But it muſt be diligently obſerved what kind of Revelation and teſti-*

testimony of the Spirit it is, whereby we may be said to be assured of the Scriptures divine Truth. It is not any inward suggestion and inspiration different from those Revelations that are in the Scriptures themselves, as if the Spirit did by a second, private particular Revelation assure me of the Truth of those former revelations made in the Scriptures: We have no Warrant for any such private Revelation now, nor is there any need of them. How then doth the holy Ghost reveal to us the Truth of Scriptures? I answer, by removing those impediments that hindred, and by bestowing those Graces that makes us capable of this Knowledge. There's a twofold Impediment. 1. Ignorance. — 2. Corruption. — This holy Spirit cureth the. 1. By Illumination restoring our decayed understanding. — The second by Sanctification, infusing into our Desires and Affections some Degrees of their primitive Holyness. ——— pag. 216. *Other inward and secret Revelations of the Spirit we acknowledge not in this Business.*]

Sect. VIII.

As to your passages, *pag.* 382, 383. about opinion and science. 1. Faith is commonly said to be neither opinino nor Sciences: (Though for my own part, I have given my reasons for its evidence against *Baronius* and *Rada*, *Apol. Part* 1. *pag.* 134. *&c.* and against *Hurtado* in *Treat.* against Infidel. Determ. *pag.* 68. *Fransc. Mayco*, and many others maintain it to be evident and demonstrable. *Ariminensis*, and many more with him deny it, saying, (*ut Arminens. contra Mancon*) that it hath *evidentiam credibilitatis*, *non autem certitudinis*: which satisfieth not me: but if it hold, it may shew the impertinency or invalidity of your arguing. 2. If Faith must have a *scientifical medium*, or if a credible *medium* be enough and distinct, yet still this *Medium* is extant to the unsanctified in the word of God, without an inward prophetical Inspiration. And though they see it not savingly, yet they see it superficially, and with a common faith. It was the same Reasons that prevailed with many of the sanctified and the Temporaries to believe, but not apprehended by the same

ſame faith. *Ameſius* (*ubi ſupra*) tells us that we are paſt queſtion: that in the *Lumen deferens objectum* as he calls it there is no difference. It was the ſame Seed that fell and grew among the thorns, and in the ſtony ground, as in the good ground, though it had not the ſame ground and entertainment, being received but ſuperficiently into the one, and being over-topt and choaken with predominant enemies in the other. If an unſanctified Divine may ſtudy, preach and defend every *Medium* neceſſary to Saving Faith, then may they have ſome apprehenſion and uſe of every ſuch *Medium*, but the former is true: *Ergo*——.

Where therefore you ſay, *pag.* 383. that [*Hypocrites and impious perſons have no Premiſes to infer* (the Articles of Faith) *but ſuch as are Humane and dubious and probable.*] I exceedingly Diſſent in this particular. They may have all the ſame *Premiſes* as you may have at your firſt Believing. You had Help and Light to cauſe you to ſee the premiſes which they had not, but you had no *Premiſes* more then they may have. They have the ſame Word as you. He that Believes becauſe of Gods Veracity, and his Scripture Revelation, believes upon *Premiſes*, that are better then humane dubious, and probable: but thus may Temporaries believe: *Ergo*——.

But you ask, [*What Mediums and Motives have they to believe that to be Gods Word. For their Aſſent to the Divine Truth of Gods Word can be no firmer and certain then the Premiſes which infer that Aſſent: Now Hypocrites neither have nor can have any Premiſes or Motives to Believe the Divinity of that Word, but ſuch as I named:*] *Anſw.* Far am I from the Belief of this Doctrine. 1. All the Arguments to prove the Scripture to be Gods Word, which all the forenamed Writers uſe, and Temporaries Read, and ſtudy and preach, (beſides the inward Teſtimony which you plead for) are more then Humane, Probable and dubious. But all theſe may a Temporary uſe in his way: *Ergo*——.

2. All the *Premiſes* that you had for your firſt Belief that Scripture was Gods Word, a Temporary may have: For you had a work or word of the Spirit to be made uſe of as a Premiſe to infer Belief from, before you believed. But your firſt

Premiſes (to your Saving Belief) were not ſuch as you Deſcribe *Ergo* ——.

3. Take heed of daſhing out the Chriſtian faith at a blow, and giving up the cauſe to the Infidels. For, if the inward Teſtimony of the Spirt which you mention and pretend to, be no ſurer a *Medium* or *Premiſe*, to infer Scripture to be Gods Word from, then ſome of the other that you affirm to be but dubious, humane or probable then according to you, there is no Argument for Scripture, that is better then ſo: But the Antecedent is certain. For all thoſe Arguments mentioned by the forecited Writers, from that *Intrinſick Light*, by which the Scripture, as the Sun is ſeen, and from *Propheſies fulfilled*, *uncontrouled Miracles* Sealing it, *&c.* are as ſure, as any a man before his firſt believing or in the Act (yea or after) can fetch from within him: (Though ſtill he muſt have a Light within him from the Spirit to ſee them: which is none of his Premiſes.) Yea, if inward Holineſs or the Spirits Teſtimony be the only Evidence, yet that Holineſs and Spirit in all the ſanctified, (which is more then in one man) is one of the *Premiſes* or a *Medium* which an unſanctified man may uſe: And though he have not the experimental knowledge of it, and ſo not the ſame manner of apprehenſion, yet the *Medium* is the ſame.

And what a Task do you ſet the Preachers of the Goſpel here, and what a caſe do you leave their Hearers in? If there be no *Premiſes* but this of an inward Teſtimony, better then humane, dubious, *&c.* then no man breathing can produce any better to unbelievers to perſwade them to believe. But they muſt ſay, [*We have no infallible, certain Medium to prove Scripture to be true, or Chriſtianity to be true: but only humane, dubious Premiſes.*] For his own inward Teſtimony his Hearers have not, nor can know it but by Believing him, which is a far more uncertain way then that you call uncertain. And how then ſhall we expect that men believe us? This is it that *Knot* and other *Papiſts* falſely charge on our Religion that we have no infallible certainty of it.

5. The Apoſtles and Evangeliſts did produce infallible *Premiſes* for faith, beſides the inward Teſtimony of the Spirit in the Hearers: therefore there is other infallible *Premiſes* to be produced.

6. Few

6. Few good Christians do believe upon the *Premise* or *Medium* of the Testimony you mention (though by the Spirits work efficiently they do?) Therefore it is not of necessity to the specifying of Saving Faith.

Lastly, I again enter my Dissent also from your great Supposition of the Necessity of infallible *Premises* to a Saving Belief of Scripture being Gods Word. The word of Revelation, is it self but the Means of our Faith: the Essentials of our faith are the matter and Form (as we may call them:) the essential material Object is the particular Articles of Faith Essential to Christianity: the formal Object is Divine Veracity; that Scripture is the Word of God, is neither the formal Object, nor any essential part of the material Object; but (as I said) it is necessary as a *Condition sine quâ non*, or a *Medium*, that the Matter be Revealed as from God by Scripture, or (as before the writing) by some other way, as Promulgation of a Law is necessary to obedience. Now as a man must hear the Law promulgate, and believe that it is really the Soveraigns Act and will before he can obey it; So we must hear or Read the Word, and be perswaded that it is the Word of God before we can *fide Divinâ* believe it. But yet as a man may by meer Report, or by the Badge on his Coat, on some meer probable Reason, think this to be the Herauld authorized to Proclaim this Law, and yet as long as he takes it to be the Kings Law, and reverenceth and obeyeth it as his, he performeth the Loyal Obedience of a true Subject, and perhaps better then some Lawyers that were at the making of it: So he that heareth the Gospel; and is perswaded that it is Gods Word, though but on weak or probable grounds, and yet doth therefore believe it because of his confidence in Gods Veracity whom he takes to be the Revealer, hath a true Divine Faith. For there is both the material and formal Object: the true Articles of faith are believed, and therefore believed because God that cannot lie is the Author of them: And that he is the Author, is first an object of Knowledge, and but secondarily of Belief. For the two Principles of faith [*That God is True, and that this is his Word.*] are in order first to be known, and then the Act of faith is built on them: Though secondarily they are both the object

of Belief it self.) And if you muſt of Neceſſity to the eſſence of your Faith, have demonſtrations, or ſcientifical, or infallible *Premiſes* apprehended to prove that the *Medium* the Scripture is of God; then muſt you have ſtill as good and certain *Premiſes*, for the proof of every one of *thoſe Premiſes*; which is not neceſſary. I confeſs the better Evidence we have of the truth of Scripture, the ſtronger our faith is like to be. But the millions of Chriſtians that take it to be the Word of God upon the common vote of the Church and their Teachers, with probable intrinſick Arguments; and yet therefore firmly believe it becauſe of Gods Veracity may have a ſaving faith. If I deny this, I muſt unchurch and unchriſtian almoſt all, or the far greateſt part of the Churches and Chriſtians in the world.

I muſt here expect that it be objected to me, that *Faith is Argumentative (what need you elſe talk of Premiſes) and the concluſion cannot excel in certainty, the weaker of the Premiſes, nor be more Divine. Anſw.* This calls for a whole Digreſſion that it may be ſatisfactorily anſwered: But becauſe all this is beſides our main Queſtion, I will content my ſelf with this ſhort touch.

It is a very great Controverſie among Divines, whether Faith be by Argumentation, and the Reception of a Concluſion as reſulting from the *Premiſes*, or a ſimple Act; and whether it have a certainty and Evidence or not. In a word, as Faith hath its material and formal Object, ſo hath it its material and formal parts to conſtitute it. And as the material objects are the Eſſential Articles of the Chriſtian faith (conſidering now but the Aſſenting part of Faith) So the Belief of theſe Articles is the eſſential matter of Faith: And as the formal Object is Gods Veracity, ſo the form of this Faith, is a crediting or Believing God as God: And as the Revelation is the *Copula* or bond of both theſe Objects, ſo the Reception of the Revelation is the conjunction of the Matter and form of Faith. In the ends and uſes of Faith there is conſiderable 1. The Acceptableneſs of it to God. 2. The ſatisfactorineſs, and operative force with our ſelves, Accordingly is its nature mixt and ſuitable, having ſomewhat of the *will*, and

and ſomewhat of the *Intellect*, The *will* hath 1. an *affiance on the Veracity of God the Author*, 2. And an *acceptance of the Good* that is offered in the material Object: the former belongs to faith *in genere*: the latter alſo to the Chriſtian Faith, or the Belief of any Promiſe, *in ſpecie*. The Veracity of God, which is the formal Object, is the Reſult of his three grand Attributes, his infinite Power, Wiſdom and Goodneſs. Theſe are Eſſential to God as God. Becauſe he is *Omnipotent*, he will not break his word through any *impotency* to fulfill it: Becauſe he is *moſt Wiſe*, he will not break it through *ignorance*. Becauſe he is *infinitely Good*, he will not break it by *unfaithfulneſs*, *fraud injuſtice*, &c. The laſt of theſe Attributes is moſt eminent in *Veracity*. Accordingly, the *formal* act of Faith, which is the *Giving credit to God* conteineth in it, or ſuppoſeth both a perſwaſion or aſſent to the Truth of this in God, (even that he is God) and a *pious Affection of the will*, by which we have a *Complacencie* and cloſure with, and an *Affiance in this* Veracity of God: All may be comprehended in *Affiance*. I am not ſpeaking of *Affiance* in the *Redeemer* to do the works of his Office for us: that belongs to Faith *in ſpecie*: but of *Affiance* in the *Power*, *Wiſdom*, *Goodneſs*, and ſo in the *Veracity* or *Fidelity* of God-Revealing or Promiſing: which belongs to Divine Faith in General (when good is in the matter, and when it is a grace.) This voluntary Affiance in Gods Veracity, being the formal Act of Faith, (together with the Acceptance of the good in the ſpecial Object,) is it wherein the Acceptableneſs of Faith, to God conſiſteth) ſo that hence you ſee, that faith formally as faith, is not the Aſſent to the concluſion of this Argument [*What ever God ſaith is true: but this God ſaith, therefore this is true*:] but it is this *Affiance* in *Gods Veracity*. But Faith as comprehending matter and form, is both. Alſo that faith is *Acceptable* to God, as it is ſuch an *Affiance* in his Veracity. And thus it needeth no formal Argumentation: or no more then to conclude that God cannot lie, becauſe he is moſt powerfull, wiſe and good. But now as to the ſatisfactory and operative uſe of faith about the material object, there it proceedeth Argumentatively, and is called an Aſſent to the concluſion, and it hath alway before us (objectively offered) ſuch evi-

dence of certainty, that where it is rightly apprehended, it is of the nature of Science; (but advanced by the formal Act of Affiance, by which it is informed to be more *Acceptable* then any bare Science.) But multitudes, and most by far discern not this evidence so clearly, as may make it scientifical to them. Nay many may discern but part of it (to prove that Scripture or these Articles are the word of God) or some few of the weaker evidences of these Revelations, or if they have the most demonstrative or certain evidences, yet they apprehend them not as such, but so weakly, that perhaps their assurance or belief of the Truth of the word, may not exceed a strong probability. The stronger any mans Assent to the matter is, the more satisfaction he hath in his mind, (and *ceteris paribus*) the more operative and effectual his faith is like to be, and so to procure further Acceptance. But yet be it never so weak, if it be sincere, it receives an acceptableness from the formal Act of holy Affiance in Gods veracity that informs it, that we may discern the material part to be sincere. It is not necessary that we find out, that it was by a certain infallible Divine *Medium*, that we took the Scripture to be the word of God (and indeed many a one that sees it by such evidence, may yet see so little of the nature and force of that evidence, that his mis-apprehension or dark and weak apprehension may make it as unsatisfactory and uneffectual to him, as great probabilities clearly apprehended may be to another) But as a humane Belief of our Teachers is an ordinary preparative or concommitant (if not some part.) So where the formal Act is firm and true (which makes it acceptable) and the material object entirely apprehended in all its essentials, the degree of apprehension is next most regardable to discern the sincerity; and because the use of this material Act is so far to satisfie us, as to lead up the Will to the acceptance of Christ offered, and to close with the felicity promised, and to be operative in us; therefore the best way to judge of the sincerity of the Assent, is, If it prevail habitually, and in the course of our lives actually, with our Wills to accept Christ as Christ, and Love God and Heaven as such, and so to prefer them before all things in the world. As Dr. *Jackson* (of saving faith)

faith,

faith; what ever doubtings there may be, or weakneſs of belief, even concerning the Truth of Scripture, and the promiſed Glory: yet he that is ſo far perſwaded of it, as that he is reſolved to venture all upon it, and rather to let go ſin and pleaſure, profit and honor, life and all, then venture the loſs of what is promiſed, and the ſuffering of what is threatned: This is a ſaving Acceptable faith, for all the weakneſs in the evidence or apprehenſion. This Anatomy of faith I give to make my ſenſe as intelligible to the Reader as is poſſible. To which add the Preface to the ſecond part of the Saints Reſt, the Preface to my Treat. againſt Infidelity, and you will ſee moſt that I have to ſay concerning this particular Subject.

As to what you add to this till *pag.* 394. to prove that Believers have the Spirit, its eaſily granted: but the Queſtion is not ſo general, nor of the word [*Teſtimony*] in general but of ſuch a Teſtimony as ſhall be the *Medium* or *Premiſe*, from which objectively the firſt Act of ſaving faith muſt neceſſarily be ſpecified, which I deny. In a whole Treatiſe (againſt Infidelity) I have pleaded for the witneſs of the Spirit to the Truth of Chriſtianity.

Page 391. Your ſixth Reaſon is, that [*elſe the unregenerate were as truly gracious and Believers as the Saints.*]

Anſw. Your Reaſon is good in my opinion: though thoſe that diſpute againſt me muſt diſclaim it, who ſay that the unregenerate are called in Scripture Saints, Believers, juſtified Sons, *&c.* and that not equivocally. Taking faith for that which is truly Chriſtian and ſaving, you might eaſily have known if you had deſired it, that I conſent to your concluſion, that the unregenerate do not believe. But yet with another ſort of faith, they do believe; and in this I ſuppoſe we are agreed, becauſe we believe Chriſt. And this other ſort is differenced but as aforeſaid. And that its true in its kind, I hope will be no controverſie between you and me, though I know not whether Mr. *Shepheard* and I are ſo far agreed but I dare venture to ſay that you and I are, that *ens & verum convertuntur.* And therefore doubtleſs you that call it ſo often [*common Grace and Faith*] do take it to be [*true common Grace and Faith.*] To gratifie

gratifie you with additions to your double Teſtimony, *p* 398. from *Calvin* and *Baronius*, I have heretofore produced 33. for the ſame Concluſion, (Diſput. 5. of Sacram,) and ſixty more for another of the ſame Importance. Yet do I not intend by this to blame you, for bringing your two witneſſes forth as againſt me, who had openly produced ſo many ſcore againſt the ſame Doctrine that you charge me with; for you might have Reaſons for it that I know not of, or at leſt be excuſable by your miſ-information.

Sect. IX.

Page 398. YOU let fall a point of great moment wherein I have long differed from you, *viz.* [*That Regenerate men by ſaving faith believe that Chriſt hath already ſatisfied for their ſins, ſo as the debt is paid, and they freed, that he hath reconciled his Father to them, that their ſins are pardoned; or they juſtified, that they are Sons of God here, or ſhall be Heirs of Heaven hereafter.*] And all theſe you ſay. [*The common Believers, neither do, nor upon any juſt ground can believe.*] And ſo at laſt we have Many Articles of faith, in which the regenerate believe and others cannot: and if ſo, the difference is more material then I thought it: but I am pretty well ſatisfied long ago; that this Doctrine is much contrary to the Goſpel, and the nature of ſaving faith.

Had you ſpoken only of that Conditional pardon and Juſtification, *&c.* That is given in the Goſpel to all that hear it, that may be believed by the unregenerate, as your foregoing expreſſions teſtifie [*They may really believe the Whole hiſtory of the Scripture to be true,*] But you mean not this, but plainly ſpeak of actual freedom, Reconciliation, Pardon, Juſtification, Adoption, and futurity of Glorification. And of theſe I am fully ſatisfied that they are no Articles of divine faith at all. But yet it is none of my purpoſe to enter the liſts with you about it, though it be a point of exceeding weight. I have in my *Apol.* to Mr. *Blake*, *my Directions for Peace of Conſcience*, and in the *Saints Reſt*, and many other writtings given

given ſome of my Reaſons already againſt this opinion: and thefore may be here the more excuſed. And as long as the teſtimony of our great Divines at *Dort* ſtands on Record againſt you, and the ſtream of our preſent Divines is againſt you, in point of Authority I have the advantage of you, though *Chamier*, *Calvin*, and ſome more tranſmarine Divines be on your ſide, or ſeem to be ſo. Mr. *Down* long ſince effectuallycon futed one of my name that held your opinion: And I muſt confeſs I the more incline to think that ſaving faith is no ſuch thing as you deſcribe, becauſe ſuch a multitude of holy men (that doubtleſs have ſaving faith) do deny that it is any ſuch thing: But yet to caſt in a breviate of my Reaſons, (that ſaving faith is not the divine Belief, that we are actually freed, pardoned, juſtified, Adopted and Heirs of Heaven) may breed no quarel.

Reaſon 1. The Goſpel containeth all the neceſſary material Objects of ſaving faith: The Goſpel containeth none of theſe propoſitions forementioned (that you or I, or *A.B. &c.* is actually juſtified, Adopted, *&c.*) therefore none of theſe propoſitions are the objects of ſaving faith.

The Goſpel ſufficiency in this is believed by all Proteſtants that I know, and by many Papiſts as to neceſſary Articles of faith. If any deny the Minor, let him ſhew me the Text that ſaith he is juſtified or adopted expreſly, or by neceſſary conſequence; If any ſay that it is a Conſequence from the Premiſes, whereof one is in Scripture, and the other in us; I have anſwered this to Mr. *Blake*, that this makes it not purely *de fide*, nor at all to be denominated *de fide*, unleſs the word of the Goſpel were the *debilius præmiſſorum*.

Rea. 2. If this which you mention were the difference between a ſaving and a temporary faith, then the difference ſhould be, that one believeth only the written word, or the Goſpel. & the other the (ſaving faith) believes alſo an unwritten word, and that which is not in the Goſpel. But this is not the difference, *Ergo. &c.*

Rea. 3. The material object of ſaving faith is propounded by God to all men that hear the Goſpel, and all com-

manded to believe it. But this; (that they are actually justified, &c.) is not so, nor all commanded to believe it, *Ergo.* &c.

If it were all mens duty, some must believe a falshood. If you say that it would be a Truth consequently, if they could believe it: I answer, It must be a truth antecedently, or else the first act of faith is false. If you say, that men are first commanded to repent and then believe, I answer; No repenting without faith will prove them justified: therefore upon no such repenting may they believe they are justified. If you say some other Act of faith goes first, and justifieth us, I answer; Then it is that other Act that is justifying faith.

Rea. 4. The unbelief that condemneth men is not the not believing that they are already justified, Adopted, &c. Therefore the faith that saveth men is not the believing that they are justified, Adopted, &c. for they are contraries.

Rea. 5. The material Object of divine faith (of assent) is some word of God, at left written or unwritten. But the Articles mentioned by you, are (as to the Church ordinarily) no word of God, written nor unwritten: therefore they are not the Object of divine faith. If they be in the written word, let it be produced; which cannot be done. If it be an unwritten word (in the heart) they that affirm it must produce or prove it, which they cannot do. And the common experience of Believers is, (as far as I can learn from themselves) that there is no such thing; for though they know of a Spirit effecting faith in them, that is, causing them to believe an Object already revealed, yet they know of none, propounding a new word or Object of faith to be believed as the Gospel is. The effects of the Spirit indeed (Faith, Love, &c) are the Objects of a reflex knowledge (as its called) but not of Faith: though they consequentially confirm us in the Faith, having therefore no ordinary divine word in us, we can have no divine faith.

Rea. 6. If our own inward Graces be the object of saving Faith, then are we saved by believing in our selves, or somewhat of our selves, (*viz*, That we are justified, adopted, &c.

&c.) But the Conſequent is untrue, therefore ſo is the Antecedent. Saving faith is a believing in Chriſt.

Rea. 7. That which no man hath before his firſt believing cannot be the material Object of his firſt ſaving faith (and therefore ſpecifieth it not, nor is eſſential to it.) But no man hath before his firſt believing either actual Juſtification, Adoption, *&c.* Therefore neither of theſe can be the object of our firſt ſaving faith. The Major is plain, becauſe the object is before the Act. The Minor is proved, in that Unbelievers are not juſtified, Adopted, *&c.*

Rea. 8. The Doctrine that makes Juſtification, Adoption, *&c.* to go before faith, and be the portion of Infidels, is unſound: but ſuch is yours. For men muſt have theſe before they can truly believe that they have them, and ſo before your ſaving faith.

Rea. 9 If that I be bound to believe (to Salvation) that I am actually juſtified, then either that I am juſtified by faith or without faith: not without, for that's againſt the Goſpel; not by faith for I yet have it not at firſt, and after either I am bound to believe that I do believe or not, if not ſtill the concluſion will not be *de fide*, becauſe my believing (which is not by a word of God affirmed) is the *pars debilior* of the Premiſes. If I am bound to believe that I do believe, then alſo muſt I be be bound to believe, that I believe, that I do believe, and ſo on: for why ſhould I be bound to believe one Belief, and not to believe another, even that Belief alſo. It was never known that faith was its owne ſpecifying Object.

Rea. 10. If my own inward qualifications or receivings from the Spirit are the Object of ſaving Faith, and the Goſpel the Object of common faith; Then common Faith hath a perfect Object, and ſaving faith (where it differs from it) hath an imperfect Object: (for ſuch is both our ſanctification, and our Juſtification at leſt, as revealed to us, or the Revelation of our Juſtification.) But the Conſequent is unſound:

found, therefore so is the Antecedent. I dare not compare my inward evidences with the Gospel.

Rea. 11. If the Spirits inwards Testimony that I am justified, Adopted, *&c*, be the object of saving faith, then one true Christian hath more to believe, and another less, and there are as great variety of Objects as of Christians; and some are bound to believe much seldomer, as well as less, then others: (For he that hath not the Object is not bound to believe it: but some Christians (at most) have it but seldom, and but little;) But the Consequent is untrue, therefore so is the Antecedent. Though Christians have several degrees and seasons of exercising faith, yet they are bound to exercise it more and oftner then they do. And it is not made impossible for want of a word to be the Object.

Rea. 12. Also it would follow that the same man is one day bound to believe (if there be such a Testimony) and another day not: and perhaps another moneth or year: yea perhaps some should never be bound to believe: for none have that Testimony constant, and many Christians never have that at all, which is unfitly called an inward word or Revelation; that we are adopted by immediate Testimony. But *&c.*

Rea. 13. (Though the Spirit work faith, yet) the testifying sealing Spirit is given to Believers and after faith, therefore saving faith goeth before it, and is without it.

Rea. 14. If our own Adoption, Justification, *&c.* be the Objects of our saving Faith, and it be an Article of Faith that you are justified, *&c.* then to doubt of your Justification, Adoption, *&c.* is to doubt of the word of God: and to deny your own Justification, is to deny the word of God, and so all that you thus speak against your selves in your doubtings, you speak against the Truth of the word of God: But the Consequent is unsound, *Ergo.* &c.

Rea. 15. Our inward real Graces are the Objects of our knowledge by the reflexion (or as some say, by intuition.)

There-

Therefore they are not the Objects of saving faith. For though the same thing as extrinsecally revealed may be the Object of both, because of different Revelations, yet I suppose such different intrinsick Revelations, will not here be pretended: nor is it necessary that when the Spirit hath first given us Grace, and then by an inward light and efficiency, caused us to perceive it, and know that we have it, he should after give us an immediate word to tell us of that which he had before caused us to know (as he causeth us to discern extrinsick Objects.)

Rea. 16. The Articles of saving faith may be expressed in the Churches Creed, but so cannot these new Articles that you mention: For there must be the names of so many, and such individual persons, as cannot be known; nor will it be certain. For you will not be content with the general, that *he that believeth shall be saved*; but there must be in your Creed, [*I am justified, Adopted*, &c.] which who can know but they that have it? And so their Creed is utterly uncertain to the Church, yea and every man hath a distinct Creed of his own: There being one Article in it (*that he is justified*) that no man else is bound to believe: and so there must be as many Creeds as Believers.

Rea. 17. The Articles and Object of saving faith may be preached to some (at left) that are uncalled, and they required to believe: But your Object and Articles can be preached to no man, therefore they are not the Articles and Objects of saving faith. No one unconverted man in the world can be called on to believe that he is justified, unless he be called to believe an untruth, or according to the Antinomian Doctrine of Justification before Faith, he can have no knowledge or discovery first that it is the true.

Rea. 18. Were your Articles necessary Objects of a saving Faith, then all presumptuous ungodly persons are justified for not believing (yea and all others.) For, 1. Its as natural Impossibility (as is aforesaid) to believe without an Object, as

to see without Sun or Light. The holiest man could not do it, 2. And presumptuous persons have the Act; and its not long of them that there is no object for it: They are confident that they are justified, Adopted, &c. But you say [*They do not or cannot believe it.*] But why is that? Because they *believe* not, even when they do *believe* it. I mean, (having no word of Revelation,) the name of Belief is not due to the Act: but thats not long of them. They are confident that God hath Justified them and will save them, as well as you. Though you say you have a word for it within you, which they have not.

Reason 19. The Scripture telleth us an hundred times over of another Faith as certainly saving, without your Articles: therefore these Articles are not necessary to saving Faith, to cite but a few Texts, *Rom.* 10.8,9,10,11. [*That is the word of faith which we preach, that if thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, and shalt believe in thy heart that God raised him from the dead, thou shalt be saved: for with the heart man believeth unto Righteousness*, &c.] Here note 1. that this is the Word that is said to be in the heart, *vers.* 8. And 2. yet it is the same that the Apostles preached. Now the Apostles did not preach to men such Articles as yours, *viz.* [*You are already actually justified, Adopted*, &c.] by name: but only this conditional Justification here mentioned. It is a *Believing to Righteousness*, and not a *Believing that we are Righteous* which they preach and require: It is a *Believing Christs Resurrection*, &c. and not our *own honesty or felicity or pardon*, &c. So that this same word which is preacht by the Apostles, is it that is *in the heart*, and not another Gospel or Word of God; *viz.* [*Thou A. B, art justified.*] So *John* 1.12. *As many as received him, to them gave he power to become the Sons of God, even to them that believe in his name.*] They must believe that they may become Sons; which is not a believing that they *are sons*, Rom. 4.24. Faith [*shall be imputed to us for Righteousness, if we believe on him that raised up Jesus our Lord from the dead.*] This is the saving Faith, which is imputed to us for Righteousness; and therefore is not a Believing that we are righteous. *Acts* 13.38.39. *Forgiveness of sins preached through Christ, and by him*

him all that believe are Justified from all things,&c.[They believe before they are justified, and therefore not that they are justified.But I have said enough of this heretofore in my Confession.

Reason 20. All the Articles of the true saving Christian faith, have been still owned by the Catholick Church; These Articles that you mention have not been still owned by the Catholick Church, therefore they are not Articles of true saving Faith. They are not to be found in the Creeds of the Church, nor Writings of the Fathers of the Church, therefore they are not owned by the Church. All in the Creed that is pretended is,the [*I Believe*] with [*the Remission of sins*,] which is not [*I believe that my sins are already remitted*: For the *Catechumens* were to profess this faith, and all were bound to believe it. Other Reasons I have given elswhere.

I cast in all these Reasons haftily, not improved as I should do, if I were to make a Defence of the Truth; but to give you an account of the cause of my Dissent, because I find this the principal point of all our Difference.

Yet that we seem not to differ more then we do,I must again refer you to my *Treatise of the Spirits Witness within us to the Truth of Christianity*, § 2. &c. to know my Concessions. To which I also add, that all that believe in Christ, do believe in him *for Remission of their own sins*, and do by consent *Accept him and pardon offered by and with him*: and when they profess to be Believers, they profess those *Premises* from whence they may conclude that they are pardoned: And so far as they know that they sincerely believe, they may and ought to conclude that they are pardoned. Yet its not a Word of God,much less an Article of saving Faith.

Sect. X.

Page 399. YOu next inſtance in *Acceptance and Love to Chriſt.* And I grant you ſtill the concluſion, that theſe are not in the unregenerate in the ſame *ſpecies* as in the Saints. But that there is a Love and Acceptance true in its kind, andhow it materially differs from that in true Believers, I have oft ſhewed, and ſhall do here further in my Additional Explication.

I ſaid in my Aphoriſms, that [*the Acceptance of an offered Chriſt is the eſſential Form of Juſtifying Faith.*] (not of Faith *in genere*,) and you ſay that I ſaid ſo of [*Love.*] I know there is *Love in Acceptance*, or *Conſent*, or *Choyce*: but if I might have choſen, I had rather you had charged me with what I indeed wrote, then with what you imagine may be implied in it.

Page 403. Your eighth Reaſon for the Cauſe that I maintain, is ſound and undeniable.

Hence you paſs *page* 404. to another Controverſie, anſwering this Objection [*Love may be Eſſential to faith, becauſe its agreed that* Fiducia *is an Act of Faith, and that in the Will, and not only Mr.* Baxter, *but* Bellarmine *and many reformed Divines ſay ſo.*] *Anſw.* 1. I lookt in *Bellarmine*, and find him with the common vote of Schoolmen, and Divines placing *Fiducia* in the will, but ſo far is he from making it an Act of Faith, that the Poſition that he is there proving is, that [*fides non eſt fiducia,*] againſt the Proteſtants, and concludes as you, that that *fiducia ex fide oritur, non poteſt eſſe idem cum fide.* Sure you did not indeed mean to prove hence that *Bellarmine* is of the Proteſtant opinion which he writes againſt. I ſuppoſe your intent was to limit his conſent to the laſt clauſe of the Subject of Affiance.

2. You might well ſay many Reformed Divines are for the point which you aſſault; for it is ſo common, that with Papiſts and our ſelves, it goes commonly as the Proteſtant cauſe.

As to your firſt Reaſon (and your whole cauſe) you utterly miſtake and miſ-report the cauſe. It is not a παλαιοφωνία that

Proteſtants

Protestants commonly mean by Affiance; no nor a πεποίθησις neither as that word most usually signifieth the confidence or perswasion of the intellect in a high Degree. But it is the very πίστις or Faith it self, which we commonly express in English by [*Crediting, or giving credit to a man; Trusting him, or having affiance in him.*] And therefore our Divines do commonly maintain against the Papists that πιστεύειν εἰς *inscriptum* signifieth *fiduciam ponere*; and *fidem habere*; which is our *Affiance*. And our Translators thought sure that to *Trust in God*, and *to hope in him* was all one, (and so to Trust or Hope in Christ) when they so ordinarily translate ἐλπίζω by Trusting, as in *Luke* 24,21. Ἡμεῖς δὲ ἠλπίζομεν ὅτι αὐτὸς &c. The sense also shews it is not Hope as commonly defined that is here meant. So *Matth.* 12,21. & *Rom.* 15.12. Καὶ ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι αὐτοῦ ἔθνη ἐλπιοῦσι *And in his Name shall the Gentiles trust.* And the first Believers of the *Ephesians Paul* calleth τοὺς προηλπικότας ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ, *those that first trusted in Christ*, which is all one in *Pauls* sense with believing in him; for in the next verse [ἐν ᾧ πιστεύσαντες] is used as Synonimal, to signifie the same thing. And so in 1 *Tim.* 4.10. & 6.17. *Phil.* 2.19 and other places, our Translators call this [*Trusting in God,*] which is our Affiance; and undoubtedly an act of the Will. And when other words (as frequently) are used, it is the same thing that is intended in many places of Scripture, which our Translators call [*Trusting in God.*] Now besides your Plerophory or Perswasion, there is in the nature of saving faith not only another Affiance, but a double Affiance essential to it in some degree: as I shall take the liberty according to my apprehension to open it.

Belief is either *voluntary* and *a Duty*, or *involuntary, and no moral good.* The latter is the faith of the Devils, and all that believe the Truths of God as things that are against them, and would not have them to be true, and perhaps had rather not believe them (for the understanding is not free in it self.) This kind of belief is meerly of the Intellect: The voluntary vertuous Belief of God, is either of some things that we apprehend as *meerly True*, and having no other good in them as to us but the Truth (nor perhaps to others) There *are* no such Revelations; but yet our apprehensions may be such of them.

Here Truth it ſelf is a certain ſort of Good. And thus the Intellect receiveth theſe Truths, but not alone: For the Will hath a double concurrence. 1. Looking with Complacency on the good of verity Revealed, 2. Looking with a Complacencial Affiance or Truſt to the Veracity of God the Author or Revealer. Thus it is that we believe ſome Hiſtories. II. Or this voluntary Belief is of things *hurtful* to us, in our apprehenſion, as in caſe of our belief of Threatnings. Here the Will hath an *Averſneſs* to the *material Object*; but ſtill hath a complacency joined with it both in the *General Good of Verity*, even as in a Threatning, and a Complacency in, and voluntary approbation of the Veracity of God in his Threatnings. Thus it ought to be: And this compliance of the Will with Gods Veracity in a Threatning, is not commonly called Affiance; but a conſenting or Complacencial Approbation. III. This Belief hath ſometime a Revelation apparently good to us, (or to the Church, or our Brethren and Gods honour) for its Object. Thus all merciful Narratives, Offers and Promiſes, are believed? And here are theſe Acts. 1. The Intellect apprehendeth the Veracity of God-Revealing. 2. The Will hath a Complacencial Approbation of this Veracity of God as good in it ſelf and a Divine perfection. 3. The Intellect Apprehendeth the Letter and ſenſe of the Revelation. 4. And the Truth of it as proceeding from Divine Verity it ſelf. 5. And the Goodneſs of it as its Truth in General. 6. And the ſpecial Goodneſs of it from the Matter in ſpecial. 7. And the Will concurreth in theſe Apprehenſions by *Commanding* the Intellect according to that Degree as the acts are *Imperate*. 8. And the Will hath a ſpecial *Affiance* or *Truſt* (together with the Intellect acquieſcing herein) in the *Veracity of the Revealer* as it reſpecteth this ſpecial Object. For as 9. The ſame Will hath a *Complacency*, or *Conſent or Acceptance*, as to the *Good Revealed, Promiſed, Offered*; ſo it hath an anſwerable reſpect to the Power, Wiſdom and ſpecial goodneſs of God that promiſeth; and ſo looking at his Veracity (the reſult of theſe three) as the Foundation and formal Object of his faith, he muſt needs look at it with a ſpecial Volition. which we commonly call Affiance or Truſt; and this laſt is the very Act that is called

led by the name of *fides*, *or fiducia*, or *Affiance*, comprehending the reſt, but ſo as that they are all denominated uſually from this as the perfective Act. And this is the Affiance, that we ſay is eſſential to Faith in general as it hath a Promiſe, for its material Object, and which is directly ſignified by πιστεύειν εἰς ὁτι τὸν Θεὸν, To truſt a mans word, or to credit him, or take his word, or truſt his credit, and to believe him, and have Affiance in him, are all one. IV. The ſpecial faith of the Goſpel called faith in Chriſt, conteineth all theſe nine Acts aforeſaid, and a tenth ſuperadded which is a ſpecial Affiance in Jeſus Chriſt as the Saviour to do the works of his undertaken Office, in our Salvation. So that all theſe ten Acts are in ſaving faith, as they are diſtinguiſhed by the ſeveral objects; which yet are all but one faith in a moral ſenſe, and all theſe but the ſeveral parts of the Object. He that denieth this, muſt in equity except againſt thoſe particular Acts that he thinks may be left out.

By this much I have told you what acts of the Intellect, and what of the Will are in faith, and what Affiance is in it: *Two acts of Affiance* are in ſaving faith. The firſt is an *Affiance, or Truſt in, or crediting of God as the Promiſer, becauſe of his Veracity*: This is in the *Genus*. The ſecond is, *An Affiance in the Redeemer as ſuch*, by which we Truſt in him for the effects and Ends of his Office. And this is eſſential to the *Chriſtian faith in ſpecie*. All theſe are comprized in theſe three General acts. 1. *Aſſent*. 2. *Conſent or Acceptance*. 3. *Affiance*. This *laſt Affiance* in *the Mediatour*, is not the ſame with the *General Affiance* in *God as Promiſer*, before mentioned. This is the act that was commanded the *Jaylor*, (comprizing the reſt) *Act.* 16. 31. πίστευσον ὁπ τὸν Κύριον Ιησῦν Χριστὸν καὶ σωθήσῃ &c.] To theſe is Adoption given, *John* 1.12. τοῖς πιστεύουσιν εἰς τὸ ὄνομα αυτῦ,]So *Rom.* 4.5. and 10.14. *& paſſim.*

Now the Plerophorie that you call *Affiance*, is either an *Aſſurance or Confident perſwaſion* of our own particular ſtate of Grace; or of our particular Acceptance with God in our addreſſes, or elſe ſome high Degree only of the forementioned Affiance or Aſſent. Now it is none of theſe that *we* call *Affiance*, when we make it eſſential to ſaving faith. *Ameſius* ſhews ſomewhat of the difference in *Medul. Theolog. l* 1. *c.* 3. *& l.* 2.

cap. 5. Where also he largely proveth faith to be in the Will; and yet your forementioned special Articles are none of its object: *Assensus verò specialis quo statuimus Deum esse nostrum Deum in Christo, non est actus primus fidei, sed actus ex fide emanans. Nulla enim est major in te quam alio certitudo hujus veritatis, nec verior ejus apprehensio, antequam te ad Deum fide singulariter applicaveris,* saith *Pemble, Vindic. Grat. pag.* 260. [*that kind of Fiducia which we call Assurance, and full perswasion of the pardon of our sins, is a fruit of the other Fiducia, or Trusting unto the Promise it self, wherein stands the proper Act of Justifying Faith. And it follows it not alwayes presently, but after some long time, after much paine taken in the exercise of Faith and other Graces.*] But that the other *Fiducia* is essential to faith he proves by several Arguments; *pag.* 258. (In which our more voluminous Disputants against Popery are much more copious.) And *pag.* 170. 171. Where in the Margin he saith, [*It is an erroneous curiosity to make Fiducia a Consequent of Fides, and to say therefore I trust a man because I believe the truth of his promise, that he will do what he sayes; there can be no good construction of such a saying: for it is as much as this; I trust him because I trust him.* &c.]

And thus your first Censure is answered: Affiance is essential to true faith.

Sect. XI.

Page 406. YOur second answer of the Objection you chose is, by alleadging from *Rob. Baronius* two Reasons to prove that *Fiducia* is not in the Will. The first is [*Because Diffidence is not in the Will.*] *Answ. Fiducia* is an act both of the Understanding and Will, and *Diffidence* is seated in both. *Diffidence* in the Will is mostly a Privation of the Trust and Affiance aforementioned. Your Argument from *Baronius* to prove it only in the Understanding is, [*because men may distrust themselves, which signifieth not a hatred.* &c] *Answ.* 1. Though it signifies no hatred or aversation, it may signifie a Privation of the Trust and boldness, and expectation of the will and understanding both. If *uti* and *frui* be acts of the will, then so may

may Affiance. Do you think *Hope* is in the will or not? I do not think you will be so singular as to deny it. And then I would ask whether *Despair* be in the Will? If *Despair* be, so may *Diffidence*. And here I may put you to answer your own Argument. A man *Despaireth* of himself and his own affairs, without Hatred or Aversation: therefore Despair is not in the Will. If you say there is a certain Aversation of the will from the evil of his affairs, in Despair I shall say, it may be as truly said of that Diffidence which is a full contrary to Trust, If you say that Despair is in the will, as a Privation of Hope, I shall say then so is this Diffidence as a Privation of Trust.

Page 407. You confirm the inopinion of *Baronius* from the [*the use of mediums to breed Confidence*] But, 1. That proves *Affiance*, as its taken for strength of Assent to be in the Intellect, but not as taken for the *fiducial acquiescence* or *expectation* of the Will. 2. It proveth *Affiance* in the Scripture-sense (as taken for faith) to be in the understanding but not to be in the understanding alone: For affiance as hope is a complicate Act of the Intellect and Will, not physically one, but morally one, and Physically so admirably complicate, that its very hard to distinguish them.

Page 408. You give us *Baronius* his second Argument [*si formaliter esset actus voluntatis, nil aliud esset quam desiderium, seu amor objecti: & multi amant & desiderant objectum, qui non habent fiduciam: &c.*]

Ans. The Consequence is without all appearance of Truth (in my eyes) for it is the material object; whose love he and you do blainly speak of: but the love of the material object as the end is presupposed to the Act of the Affiance in veracity and word of the Promiser as the means: and it is from this formal object, that *Affiance* is denominated I do not *trust the pardon of sin, Justification, Adoption*, though I love and desire them: but I trust Gods Promise, because of his veracity for the pardon of sin: But if the Promise it self be the object which you mean; yet I answer. 1. My love to the Promise is because of the good promised, & therefore primarily to the benefit, and but secoundarily to the Promise: but my Trust is primarily in Gods veracity, and next in the Promise as the product of that veracity, and not at all in the benefit, but for the benefit promised: I love the

Benefit or good promiſed formally, and I love the Promiſe for the benefits ſake finally, and as mediatly participating of the goodneſs loved. But I truſt in the Divine veracity formally, and in the Promiſe ſecondarily, as partaking of it as the matter in which it is expreſt: But the good of the benefit is only finally pertinent to Affiance, and the good of the Promiſe as the means to that end.

2. I further anſwer to this (and at once to the confirmation of the Minor) that there is *aliquid deſiderii & amoris in affiance*, and eſſential to it, as there is *aliquid boni* eſſential in the object. But being a compound act, it follows, not that it muſt be denominated Love or Deſire, or that it is *nil aliud*. Even the divine veracity is the formal object of affiance, not ſimply, but as the Author and Informer of a Promiſe of good things: For it is not called the object of affiance; if it produce only an aſſertion that maketh to our hurt. And the Promiſe is the object of affiance as a relative thing that hath reſpect at once both to the veracity of the Promiſer and the good that is promiſed. Hope hath ſomewhat of Love and ſomewhat of Deſire in it eſſentially, And yet it is not to be called Love or Deſire no more then a man is to be called [*Reaſon* or *Intellect*, or *Will*, or a *Body*, or a *Soul*: ſo faith hath ſomewhat of Hope and of Love in it, and yet is not to be called Love or Hope: of which more anon.

To the confirming Reaſon I anſwer; Its true that many love and deſire that which they have no affiance or truſt to obtain: and that proves that Love and Deſire are not terms convertible with *Affiance* or Faith: but it proves not that *affiance* or faith hath no participation of Love or Deſire. There is Love eſſential to all Deſire: & yet a man may love that which he deſireth not (if he have it already,) though he cannot deſire that which he loveth not There is Love & deſire eſſentially in hope, and yet eſſential to hope, a man may love & deſire that which he hopeth not for. There is expectation eſſential to Hope, and yet I may expect that (as a hurt or injury,) which I hope not for. And yet you will tell me that which I know not, if you tell me of any thing eſſential to Hope beſides this deſire (cõprehending love) & expectation: I take it to be a compound of Deſire and expectation (or at moſt with ſome acquieſcence and

and pleasure of the mind conjunct.) Yet neither of them alone is Hope.

Page 409. You add a third Reason to prove that Affiance is not in the Will, from [*the use of the words in all good Authors* :] But what words ? πληροφορία and πεποίθησις ; but 1. *Amesius* (*Medul.li* 1. *ubi sup.*) tells you that even these words in several Texts of Scripture signifie saving faith 2. But what's this to our Question, you should have limited it to one sort of Affiance, and not have spoke thus of all Affiance in general, nor of that which Protestants plead for in special. Prove it if you can that πιστεύειν εἰς τὸν Θεὸν, or the english Trusting, or Affiance, or the Latine *fiducia* or *fides*, are not acts of the Will. And of this, we call not for proof from prophane Authors, but sacred, as knowing that πίστις and πιστεύειν is not the same thing with them and with the Scriptures : See Mr. *Gataker's Cinnus*, *pag.* 383, 384 385. And against *Pfochenius de novi instrumenti stylo*, *pag.*88,89. where he citeth abundance of Scripture Texts, where πίστις and πιστεύειν εἰς are used for Faith and Affiance, or Trust to his Word that promiseth us some good, which is not the use of the words with prophane Writers. And of your own sense of *fiducia*, see *Chamier de fide*, *li.* 12. *chap.* 11. *in Panst.* And *Amesii Bellarmini. Enervat. Tom. li.* 5.2, *and* 3. proving that faith is *Affiance*, and *cap.* 1. citing *Card. Contarenus*, *Alexand. Ales*, *Bonaventu*, *Durandus*, *Cajetan*, affirming it to be in the Will as well as the Intellect. To conclude therefore your *Plerophorie* is not (alwaies at left) in the Will, but *fides vel fiducia*, *Trust*, *Affiance*, *Faith* are in the Intellect and Will.

You conclude that [*He that after all this*, *shall still say that* fiducia *is in the Will*, *I will not say he is impudent*, *but sure a little thing will not make him blush*.]

Answ. For my part I was naturally sufficiently bashfull, but my Brethren have notably assisted me in the cure of it : But I must confess that I see nothing yet in your Arguments, nor in the badness of my cause or company to make me blush. Much more hath been said by *Bellarmine* and many more, since this controversie begun among us ; then you have here said ; and yet almost all Protestant Divines that ever I read

or

or heard of, (excepting very few noted for singularity) do without bluſhing hold to the old cauſe in this point, aſſerting Faith to be eſſentially *fiducia*, and in the Will: And the few that confirm it to the Intellect, do moſt of them make that Intellectual Aſſent to contain an Intellectuall Affiance.

And for *Baronius*, whoſe reaſons, you urge, he was young and raw when he wrote thoſe exercitations, and ſince that did change his mind in many particulars; as you may for inſtance ſee in your point of the Spirits Teſtimony, which in his *Diſput. againſt Turnbullus*, he otherwiſe handleth then here. I ever lookt (ſince I had any acquaintance with them and thoſe matters) on his exercitations, as the unripe fruits of an excellent wit: and valued then more for what they promiſed and attempted, (then in many points) for what they performed: but his after-labors, even the poſt-humours have ſo much more Maturity and ſolidity of conceptions, that I muſt ſay it is pitty they had not been more perfected, and God had not longer ſpared us that man, whoſe Judgement I value as highly as almoſt any mans ſince the primitive times of the Church. But what reaſon gives he why *fiducia* in his ſecond ſenſe is not an Act but effect of faith? *viz.* [*ut accipitur pro interna acquieſcentia in divina benevolentia & gratiâ, per quam toti ab illa pendemus, &c.*] *page* 233. Or rather as it is an Acquieſcence in the veracity of the Promiſer. You know alſo that he is put to defend his ſingularity by anſwering theſe Objections. [*Si fiducia eſt in intellectu non differt ab aſſenſu, ut hoc repugnat Doctrinæ omnium Orthodoxorum,*] *page.* 241, *Et nullus unquam Orthodoxus Theologus dixit fiduciam eſſe aſſenſum aut judicium mentis.*] *page.* 242. I confeſs I have long taken thoſe paſſages of *Baronius* which you alledge, for ſome of his chifeſt overſights: and I yet ſee no cauſe to think otherwiſe.

Among others (commonly given by our Divines) theſe following reaſons move me to think that Affiance as ſignified by πιστεύειν εἰς τὸν Θεόν, *&c.* in Scripture, and by our engliſh word *Truſt*, is in the Will as well as in the Intellect.

Reaſon

Rea. 1. If Affiance or Truſt be only in the Intellect, then may we be ſaid to put our Truſt or Affiance in threatning, whoſe Object is ſome miſchief to us : but this is *inauditum*, and ſo the Conſequent is falſe, therefore ſo is the Antecedent.

Rea. 2. The Goſpel or Promiſe, as the Object of our faith or Truſt, are eſſentially good as well as true : therefore faith muſt be eſſentially in the Will as well as the Intellect.

Rea. 3. Chriſt himſelf as he is the Object of our faith or Truſt, is good as well as true : therefore that faith muſt be the act of the Will as well Intellect.

Rea. 4. Juſtification, Adoption, Glorification, and the other benefits, which by faith are to be received, are offered as good, therefore the receiving of them belongs to the Will.

Rea. 5. Hope and Deſpare are not only in the Intellect, therefore Affiance is not only in the Intellect, for they differ very narrowly. Our Divines, *Chamier*, *Ameſius*, and other ordinarily make all hope to be *fiducia*, though not all *fiducia* to be *hope*, making this the difference, that the *fiducia fidei* is about the object as preſent, and the *fiducia ſpei* about the *object as future*.

Rea. 6. *Frui* and *Uti* are Acts of the Will : But one or both theſe are in Affiance, therefore *Affiance* is an Act of the Will. For the Minor, as God is the perfect Fountain of all Verity, and his Veracity is his Divine perfection ; ſo the ſoul in Affiance doth *frui*, in ſome initial ſort which *Viators* are capable of, enjoy God in this his perfection. For Affiance is a certain *Acquieſcence and Complacencie* of the ſoul in Gods veracity. 2. And as his Promiſe is the means of the benefit to be received, ſo the Will doth by affiance uſe this Promiſe to its end.

Rea. 7. Veracity which is the formal object of Faith, is as much the Reſult of Gods infinite goodneſs, as of his Wiſdom and Power : Thefore it is by faith or truſt as neceſſarily reſted on by the Will as the underſtanding.

Object. Then the *Belief of a threatning is Affiance.*

Anſw. No : There goes more then meer veracity and revelation, to the Object of Affiance. It is faith in general, if there

be but these, and when we believe a threatning: But all faith is not Affiance: It is not Trust or Affiance unless it be some desirable thing that is revealed, and then in relation to that our *Credence* or *Belief* in the Divine veracity is thus named; even when both these objects do concur. 2. Yet I add that a christian Belief, even of the threatnings of God, must be voluntary and contain a Complacency of the Will in the Will and veracity of God, though not in the evil threatned, and though so it be not called Trust. And they that believe any Truth in voluntarily upon the credit of Gods veracity, taking no degree of complacency in his veracity or Will, have not true faith *in genere*, save analogically or *secundum quid*.

Rea. 8. Scripture being a Doctrine of morality, and not of meer Physicks, is morally to be understood: and therefore according to the common use of these words in morality, Trust, Faith, Affiance are not to be limited to any one physical Act, nor any one faculty of the soul, nor to be shut out of the Will. If this Town were all infected with the Plague, and only one Physician able to cure them; if he offer them to do it freely, and some slander him as a Deceiver, and he tell them again, If you will trust me I will cure you: All the world will understand here that by trusting him, he means both the trust of the understanding and the Will, arising from some satisfaction both of his ability and honesty, and so taking him for our Physitian, and putting our lives into his hand: and so in other cases.

Sect. XII.

YOu conclude, *page* 410. with these censures. [1. That this Assertion [*common and special Grace are essentially the same.*] Is not only erroneous, but far more dangerous then many, nay most men think.] Answer. The more dangerous you take it to be, the loather you should have been, after so many explications and Disputations for your own opinon written by me) to have openly suggested that I maintain the very same thing that I deny and write against.

2. You

2. You ſay, pag. 411. [*That the other propoſition, that Charity is eſſential to juſtifying faith, is a worſe miſtake then the former, in reſpect of the many ill Conſequences, &c.*] Anſwer; As you purpoſe [*To manifeſt this, When there is neceſſity or any juſt opportunity to do it.*] as you after ſay, and thereby put us in hopes of more of your labors; ſo I think you are the Judge of neceſſity and opportunity, and ſeeing either will ſerve, I hope you will not want the later, if you do the former. But I would deſire you that if God ſhall call you to this work, and ſatisfie you that it is the beſt improvement of your precious time to ſpend in the confutation of any errors of mine, that you would do me that great favour as to underſtand me (if I ſpeak intelligibly) before you confute me, and to charge me with no opinions but my own, and that as delivered in my own words, and that taken together as they make up the full ſenſe, or at leſt that you will not confute any opinion as mine, which I have written purpoſely againſt: and alſo that you fix not on my Aphoriſms, till a corrected edition come forth; the ſubſtance of the ſame Doctrine being more plainly expreſſed by me in many other books. And if this be the opinion that you are arguing againſt, I intreat you to ſay no more as my words, [*that love is the eſſential form of faith*;] But that you may neither work want, if you are deſtinated hereunto, nor yet loſe your labor; I will before hand tell you my opinion, how far love belongs to faith; when I firſt told you. 1. That I reſolve by Gods aſſiſtance to ſay no more in ſubſtance, then is the common Doctrine of Proteſtants, as far as I can underſtand it; and therefore will have company in my cauſe. 2. That I will not ſay ſo much in terms as many of the moſt famous Proteſtants do; I will inſtance but in two.

Chamier Panſtrat. Tom 3. li. 12. *De fide*, cap. 4. proving faith to be in the Will, hath this Argument. [§. 16. *Eſt & hoc Argumentum certum: Omnis amor eſt actus voluntatis. At fides eſt amor. Ergo eſt actus voluntatis: Major per ſe vera & cognita; Minor probatur, quia vera fide, eſt ea, quæ credit in Deum, at credere in Deum, eſt amare Deum.* Auguſtinus, *in* Pſal. 130, *Hoc eſt credere in Chriſtum, diligere Chriſtum. Et in* Johan, tract. 29. *Quid eſt credere in Deũ? Credendo amare; & verò victus hoc argu-*

gumento Gropperus *in* Enchiridio, *&c.*] and so he cites him as consenting.

The other is, *Macchovius*, who, 1. *Colleg. Disput. de Justific. Disp.* 14. §. 10, 11. 12, 13. answering *Camero's* objection, that by placing faith in the Will we confound it with Love, answereth, [*That the love of Complacency is required in faith, to its object. Hence* Chemnitus *on* Melancthons *Com. places, pag.* 660, saith, [*Faith is such a knowledge in the mind, to which followeth assent in the Will, and a motion of the heart apprehending and applying to it self with desire and Affiance, that object which is manifested to be good, so that it resteth in it* : Object. *But thus faith is confounded with Charity : Which two the Holy Ghost distinguisheth specially,* 1 Cor. 13. *Answ. Charity there is considered, as it is carried to God and our neighbour, and not as it is carried to Christ as the meritorious cause, and the benefits by him obtained and promised to us in him, Which is the Charity or Love of faith, and is distinguished from the former.*] Here he proceeds to shew the difference. Now my Judgement which you have to oppose (if that be your work) is this.

1. I take it as a certain and weighty Truth that saving faith is in the Will as well as the Understanding: and so do the stream of Protestants ; though yet I highly honour *Chamero*, and the French Divines of his mind, that think otherwise.

2. I think the very Act of the Will is not properly called Love, according to the received use of that word.

3. I think that all gracious Love is not the thing directly meant by the Apostle , when he extolleth Charity as the everlasting Grace.

4. I think that Faith, Hope, and Charity, are three distinct Graces.

5. I suppose that this noble Grace of Charity is the simple Love of the Deity, as our beginning and end, and all, and of all things else for his sake, as he appeareth in them : or the Complacency of the soul in God as our God. Creator, Redeemer, Sanctifier and Felicity, or as the chief good. And that the lawfull Love of our selves, and of food, rayment, wealth, books, Sermons, humiliation Duties, *&c.* may participate

cipate of ſome beams from this higheſt Charity, but is not directly the thing it ſelf. And that faith is the *fiducial Aſſent* before deſcribed; and that Hope is the *fiducial deſirous expectation* of the promiſed Glory, and the future bleſſings that are its neceſſary Foregoers.

6. I ſuppoſe that theſe moral acts and habits are *totius hominis*, and not to be confined to any one faculty, as meer ſimple phyſical Acts, at leſt not ordinarily.

7. I ſuppoſe that as there is (as aforeſaid) *aliquid dilectionis* in Deſire, and yet it is to be called Deſire and not Love; and *aliquid dilectionis* in Hope eſſentially, and yet Hope is not Love, nor ſo to be denominated; every Grace being denominated not from all that is in it, but from that which is eminent and ſpecial in it, as to the Object; even ſo there is *aliquid fidei in ſpe, & aliquid ſpei in fide, & aliquid amoris in fide & ſpe*, and yet Faith is not Hope, nor Hope Faith, nor Love Faith.

8. The Schoolmen having ſome of them taken up a cuſtom of diſtinguiſhing between Love in the affection and in the Will, and of calling all volition by the name of rational Love: if any be reſolved to uſe their language, and to call the very act of Affiance, or of choice, or of conſent, or Acceptance of an offered Saviour by the name of Love, though I will uſe the ancient terms and not his, yet for the thing ſignified I firmly hold, that it is as eſſential to ſaving Faith in Chriſt, as the Intellects Aſſent is; and that as *Davenant* ſpeaks, Faith begins in the Intellect by Aſſent, and is compleated in the Will by the Acceptance of the offered Saviour. But this acceptance (or if you will needs call it Love) to Chriſt as the Mediator or Way to the Father, doth much differ from the formentioned Love of God as our chief good and ultimate end.

9. We are not ſaid in Scripture to be juſtified by Hope or by Charity, but by faith: but it is ſuch a faith as hath *aliquid ſpei & Amoris* in it: and will operate by theſe Graces.

10. What ſenſe ſoever the Schoolmen make of their diſtinction of *fides informis, & formata Charitate*, yet in this following ſence it may truly be ſaid, that the Love of God doth as it were animate all Graces and Duties whatſoever: that is, not as they are particular accidents which have every one, no doubt, their

own form; but as they are Right Means to the End: For as the Respect to the end is essential to the means as means, (though not to the **Act** that materially is that means,) and the end intended or Loved is the cause of the means, (it being the very nature of a final cause to be *amatum & desideratum efficaciter ab efficiente, propter quod amatum sit effectus*, as *Ockam Quodlib.* 4. *qu.* 1. *& in sent, passim*:) So the Love of God as our end, must have the same essentiall respect and influence into all the means, that are *in usu* truly and acceptably such, as the *Intentio finis* hath into all ordinary means whatsoever. If this be the sense of *fides informis & formata charitate*, I think the distinction of very great use and moment: For I think that no Prayer, Study, Alms, suffering, is any further truly and fully moralized or Theological, or Religious, that is, are acceptable means to our fruition of God (which is our Salvation) then it is caused and animated by the *Intention of God as our End*, which is the *Love* of God; and so that faith in Christ, and Repentance, and Obedience, are all *mediate* Graces, and must be thus caused and animated by the Love of God (yet so, as that in some respect faith goeth before this Love, and in some respect Love before this faith, which having lately occasion to discuss, I shall not here digress again to do it.) Of this I have said somewhat in my annexed Explicatory Propositions. I confess I never understood whether any Papists took their distinction in this sense: But I remember *Aquinas* and some other of them say something that bendeth that way, though they seem not clear in it. And so much for my sense, that you may not assault me next in the dark.

If you join with the *Lutheran Hethusius* whom you cite in *detesting them that mix Faith and Love in the act of Justification*, you will detest the Generality of Protestants, who mix that is conjoin them in the act, though not to the act of Justification as of equal use: especially if you call all acts of the Will towards Good, by the name of *Love*, for then they commonly make them one.

As for the Hereticks you mention, *p.* 411. 412. I have no business with them, I'le study Gods word, and there is no Heresie. And for the right understanding of it, I have exceeding great cause to distrust my self, and depend on the gracious teaching of his

his Spirit. But I am resolved to be as impartial as I can, with respect to the Judgement of the Catholick Church of Christ.

As to your conclusion, *pag.* 413. *&c.* I freely confess that when such unlearned scriblers as we, *impune, & infelici puerperio* as you speak, do tire the (yet unsatiable) press, unhappily bringing forth our impertinencies (I leave the impious and monstrous Heresies to the fathers or the finders to dispose of,) it were unworthy dealing if such as you should be denied liberty, to cleanse & save the Church from our Errors. And for my one part, as I think not my self meet to speak when I may be your hearer, so let my travail be never so hard, if there were but one press in *England*, which offered me its help to deliver me of my impertinencies, I were much to blame if I would not readily discharge it for your service, there being not many whose judgement (conjecturing by your Exercitations) I have preferred before yours. And therefore I take it for an honour (though not to have been mistaken by you, nor to have been the occasion of your so much trouble, yet) that I have the encouragement of so much of your Consent, and that you condescend to be at so much pains with me; where you did but think I had differed from you.

Though you chose to conceal your name, yet Tradition having published it, your labour is to be a great deal the more acceptable for the Authors sake. And if you despair of my Conversion by it, its more likely to be, because of the unteachableness of my dull understanding, them from the imperfection of your Arguments, had you but aimed at the right mark. And where I dissent with confidence because of my Reasons that seem somewhat cogent, yet is it with a mixture of self-diffidence, when, I think what a person I dissent from.

And for your Resolution [*to own and vindicate your Writing if occasion be.*] It were strange if any thing of yours should be unworthy to be owned by you; but instead of a vindication, were I your adviser, you should search after some of my greater errors, and Assault me rather in another point (if this be your Harvest work,) at least in something where really we differ, lest the world think that we are not in good sadness, and dispute not *ex animo*. But yet I leave this to your graver judgement, being so far from deprecating any of your labours to save men from the danger of

my

my opinions, as that I am tempted to be a little proud that I am chastised by so learned and eminent a man; and can promise you that your Light shall be welcome to me, and your rebukes not altogether lost. But for [*the explication and confirmation of my new untrue Hypothesis*] as you call it, you speak so much too late, that I confess I have not the skil to speak much plainer then I have already done: I have here done something, but its little but what was done before. And for the *confirmation*, you have saved me that labour.

Had I known which are the [*by-mistakes*] in yours, which you would not have severely toucht, I should have past them over without any touch at all: But if I had not expressed my Dissent from you on those points that you bring in on the by, I should have had nothing to say, but to have joined with you against that *Baxter* whoever he be, whom you assault. And, taking me for so angry a fellow as your suppositions of a passionate Reply do intimate, I knew not whether you let not fall these passages on the by, lest I should, like the angry man in *Seneca*, have fallen upon you for saying still as I say, and bid you *differ from me in somewhat that we may be two*. [*Impertinencies*] I dare not promise you to avoid: But I were very unworthy if I would be passionate with so learned and sober a man as you. But had I to do with a passionate man, I should expect to be charged with passion when ever I make him angry: as if nothing but anger could provoke anger. Even Agitation with pressure sometime sets the Turners wood on fire. When I have bin readier to nod then to be Angry, yet if I have fitted *verbarebus*, I have oft been called angry, when the Truth is, I am daily lamented that my pituitous brain and languid spirits, have deprived me of the passion that once I had; and which I daily find the want of in my stupidity. But at least I shall promise you, that if I be [*impertinent*] the very Position and Design of my whole Book shall not be *Impertinent*, nor left to the Vindication of a *Non-Putarem*. Your *prayers* and *pitty* I shall need I doubt not, and gratefully accept. But you shall not have the excuse of a *Passionate Reply* to deprive us of your Labours. As for your *Ability not to Reply*; your *petui bonas horas non sit perdere*, and your *other businesse*, I have the *Impudency* as to vie with you, and purpose so far to overgo you, as that you

you shall see *I was able to be silent*, though your writings be never so *free from Passion*, if they concern not me or the cause of God, any more then this that you have written. And if by your fore-intimations of [*Railing Rhetorick signifying nothing but Want of Reason*,] your Readers shall be brought into a conceit that they even hear me Rail before I speak, I intend to be so long silent till I have awaked them by saying nothing, and made them know that they did but dream. And whether I be reputed Reasonable or unreasonable, Passionate or Calme, Erroneous or Orthodox, though I undervalue not the Judgement of worthy men, yet am I so neer another kind of Judgement, that I have the less regard to spare for this. Even good and learned men do judge of Persons exceeding variously, as the variety of their prejudice, and interests leads them. So the Great and famous *Scaliger*, *Franc. Junius* was so great a man that [*Ab Apostolorum temporibus hactenus parem Theologum nullum vidisse seculum*] was his Elogie (*referente constantino L. Emperour.*) But to the great and famous Dr. *Twiss*, how unacquainted is he with School-Divinity? How unmeet for such Disputations? How over-witted by *Arminians?* How obscure and what not? So our excellent Bishop *Hall*. he was [*The Glory of* Leyden, *the Oracle of* Textual *and school-divinity, rich in Languages, subtile in distinguishing, and in Argument invincible.*] Epist. 7. And to the great *Thuanus*, he was [*Vir desultorio ingenio, qui multa Conatus, an adsecutus sit quod molliebatur, doctorum erit judicium.*] Hist. To. 3. l. 79.] What can be more contrary then the censures of these men? Who more Learned, more modest, and faithful in reports, then the two that are on the one side, and the two that are on the other? How vain a thing is the esteem and applause of men! we stand or fall to the Judgement of the most Great infallible God. They that take him sincerely for their God, do take him as Enough for them. And they that find not *enough* in him, will never be satisfied.

March 31. 1658.

N

FINIS.

READER, Because many that have bought the former Editions of my Book called *the Saints Rest*, do grudge that I have annexed a Sheet to the seventh Impression, on this Subject, which was not in the former, that they may have it here without buying that Book again, I shall here also annex it.

To the READER.

Reader,

I Am so loath to leave thee under any mistake of my meaning in this point, that I shall yet make some further attempt for the explaining of it. And whereas I understand that some Readers say that this nice distinguishing doth but puzzle men: and others still fear not falsely to give out, that I make common Grace and special to differ only gradually and not specifically, in despight of my express asserting of the contrary; I intreate the first sort to tear that leaf out of the Book which speaks of this Subject, that it may not trouble them, or to be patient while we speak a few Words to others; that understand that which they are but puzzled with. And I desire the second sort once more to remember. 1. *That I still affirm that common Grace and special do differ by a moral specifick difference, and not a gradual only.* 2. *But that this moral specifick difference doth materially consist in a Physical Gradual difference.* 3. *And it being a Moral subject that* we have *in hand, our terms must be accordingly used and understood, and therefore it is most proper when We speak of any unsanctified man, to say that* [*he is not a Believer, he hath no faith, he hath no Love to God,* &c.] *because We are supposed to speak only of a true Christian saving faith, Love,* &c.] 4. *But yet when it is known that we speak of another faith and love, We may well say that an unsanctified*

fied man hath these: and when we enquire of the difference, We must be as exact as possible, in shewing wherein it lyeth, lest we delude the hypocrite, and trouble the Regenerate. That the Faith, and Love, and Sanctity of the Ungodly are but Equivocally or Analogically so called, in respect to the Faith and Love of the Saints, I have proved in my fifth Disputation of Right to Sacraments.

That which I shall now add to make my sense as plain as I can, shall be these following Distinctions and Propositions.

We must distinguish between, 1. Those Gracious acts that are about our End, and those that are about the means. 2. Between God considered generally as God, and considered in his several properties and attributes distinctly. And Christ considered personally, and considered fully in the parts of his Office, whether the essential or integral parts. 3. Between the Goodness of God in himself considered, and as suitable unto us. 4. Between the simple act of the Intellect, and the comparing act. 5. Between the simple Velleity of the will, and the choice that followeth the Comperate act of the Intellect. 6. Between the Speculative and Practical act of the Intellect. 7. And between the Acts of the will that answer these two. 8. Between an End that is ultimute, but not principal and prevalent, and an End that is Ultimate and chief also.

Prop. 1. An unsanctified man may Love him that is the true God, and believe in that Person who is Jesus Christ, the Redeemer. This is past controversie among us.

Prop. 2. An ungodly man may love God as the Cause of his Prosperity in the World.

Prop. 3. He may know that his everlasting happiness is at the dispose of God, and may believe him to be merciful and ready to do good, and that to him. And consequently may have some love to him as thus Gracious and Merciful.

Prop. 4. He may by a simple apprehension know that God is Good in himself, and Goodness it self, and preach this to others. And consequently may have in his will a consent or Willingness hereof, that God be what he is, even infinite Goodness.

Prop. 5. He may have a simple Apprehension that God should be Glorified, and honoured by the creatures: and so may have a simple Velleity that he may be Glorified.

Prop. 6. He may have a General dim apprehension that everlasting

lasting Happiness consisteth in the sight of the Glory of God, and in his love and favour and heavenly Kingdom; and so may have some love to him as thus apprehended.

Prop. 7. *He may compare God and the creature together, and have a speculative or superficial knowledge that God is better then the creature, and better to him; and may write and preach this to others: And so may have an answerable superficial uneffectual Velleity or love to him, even as thus considered.*

Prop. 8. *One and the same man may have two contrary Ultimate ends of his particular Actions: Even the pleasing of God, and the pleasing of his flesh: proved.*

Argument. 1. *If the same heart may be partly sanctified and partly unsanctified (that is, in some degree) then it may have two contrary ends: Or if the same man may have flesh and* spirit, *then he may have two contrary Ultimate ends. But the Antecedent is certain,* Ergo —— *so far as a man is carnal and unsanctified, flesh-pleasing and* carnal self *is his End.*

Argum. 2. *If the same man might not have two contrary Ultimate ends, then the godly should never sin but in the mis-choosing of the means, or abating* the Degrees *of love to God: But the consequent is false and against experience,* Ergo. —— Peter *did not only mischoose a means to Gods Glory when he denied his master. A godly man when he is drawn to eat or drink too much, doth it not only as a mistaken means to Glorifie God, but Ultimately to please his flesh. Either* David *in Adultery did desire flesh-pleasing for it self, or for some other end. If for it self, then it was his Ultimate end in that act: If for somewhat else as his end, For what? no one will say his end was Gods Glory. And there is nothing else to be it.*

Prop. 9. *There is a continual striving between these two contrary ends where they are, One drawing one way, and the other the other way; and sometime one, sometimes the other prevailing in particular acts.*

Prop. 10. *But yet, every man hath one only Prevalent Ultimate end, which is to be called* Finis hominis, *or is the chief Ultimate End of the Habitual Predominant Inclination or Disposition of his soul, and of the tenour or bent of his course of life. And that which goes against this Habitual bent, is said to be the Act* [*not of*

him,

him, but of something in him] that is, not of that predominant disposition which should denominate the man to be Godly or ungodly, but of some subdued disposition that by accident hath got some advantage,

Prop. 11. *As Godly men have God for their end, as to the predominant habit of their souls, and bent of their lives, so all Wicked men in the World have the creature and carnal-self for their end, as to the Predominant Habit of their hearts, and bent of their lives: so that this is simply to be called their several end, which is the Ruling end, and hath the greatest Interest in them: But yet as carnal self is a subdued, resisting end in the Godly, prevailing in some particular Actions; (as is too sure,) so God and Salvation may be a a stifled, abused, subjected end of the ungodly that have but common Grace, and may prevail against the flesh in some particular outward Actions.*

This is evident in the foregoing Propositions. If a man by common Grace may have such a simple and superficial apprehension of God as is before mentioned, knowing him to be good in himself, yea best, and good and best to him, when yet at the same time he hath a more deep predominant habitual apprehension that the Creature is best for him, then certainly he may have a subdued Love to God as best in himself and to him, that's answerable to this superficial knowledge, and consisteth with a predominant habitual Love to the Creature and carnal Self. I would desire every Divine to beware that he tell not the unsanctified, that whoever hath the least degree of Love to God for himself, or not as a means to carnal ends, shall certainly be saved: For he would certainly deceive many thousand miserable souls that should perswade them of this. He that believeth that there is a God, believeth that he is the chief Good, and best for him if he could see his Glory, and fully enjoy his Love for ever: And many a Wicked man doth preach all this, and think as he speaks; but it is all but with a superficial opinionative Belief, which is mastered by more strong apprehensions of a contrary Good; and so they love but with a superficial Love, that's answerable to a meer opinionative Belief, and is conquered by a more potent Love to the contrary. So that strictly if you denominate not that single act, nor the person as thus disposed, but the bent *of his affections, or the* Person *according to what indeed he is in the*

Predominant habit of his Soul; *so it is fittest to say that the godly loveth not the world, nor the things of the world, and the wicked loveth not God, nor the things of God as such.*

Prop. 12. *The sincere intending* of the end, *doth concur to* constitute *a sincere choice of the means. And therefore the Schoolmen say, that Charity (or Love to God) informeth all other Graces: not being the form of them as such or such* Acts *or* Habits, *but as gracious means: As the means are essentially as means* for the end, *and so animated by it; so the mediate Acts of Grace as mediate, are essentially animated by the love of the end, and participate of it. In this sense their Doctrine of the informing of other Graces by love, is not only true, but of very great weight, and giveth light to many other points. And Thus as men of common Grace have only an abused, subdued Will or Love to God as their end, that's conquered by the contrary, so they have but an unanswerable faith in Christ, as the way to God the Father, and an answerable use of all other means, which will never bring them to attain the end that is so superficially and uneffectually apprehended and intended. I desire the learned Reader to peruse well the first Disputation of* Rada *for* Scotus, *on this question.*

Prop. 13. *The Act of Love or Faith are considerable.* 1. *Physically*: 1. *In general as Faith and Love.* 2. *In special, as this Faith and Love about this object, the Father and the Son. And thus by common Grace men may have* True *Faith and Love; that is, such as is physically a true or real Act.* 2. *They are considerable morally*: and that, 1. *Either as Duty answering a Precept* [believe and love God.] *And thus they have an analogical defective Morality in them, and so are that far, sincere or true; but not that same true Love or faith* in specie morali *which the Command requireth. For it commandeth us to love God above all,* &c. 3. *They are considerable as conditions of the Promises and Evidences of spiritual life in the soul, and thus wicked men by common Grace are never made Partakers of them. They have not the things themselves. Their Faith and Love is not the same thing which hath the Promises made to them in the Gospel; and so are not true or sincere.*

Prop. 14. *By common Grace, men may love God under the Notion of the chiefest good, and most desirable end, and yet not with*

that

that Love which the chiefest good must be loved with; and therefore it is not morally sincere or saving.

Prop. 15. *There is no notion whatsoever that a true Christian hath of God, and no Word that he can speak of him but an unregenerate man may have some apprehension of that same notion, and speak those words; and know every proposition concerning God and Christ as Redeemer, which a godly man may know: and so may have some love to God, or faith in Christ in that same notion: though not with such a clear effectual apprehension and lively powerfull love, as the sanctified have.*

Object. He cannot love God as his end. Answer. *I have proved before that he may with a superficial uneffectual subdued Love.*

Object. He cannot love him as the chief good. *Answ. I have proved that he may love him under that notion, though not with that love which the chief Good must be loved with.*

Object. He cannot believe in Christ, or desire him, as a Saviour to free him from every sin. *Answ. Not with a prevalent faith or desire; for still he hath more love then averseness to that sin; and therefore more Averseness then love to Christ as such: But as in general he may wish to be free from all sin, so in particular he may have uneffectual wishes to be from his most beloved sin in several respects.*

Object. But not to be free from sin as sin, or as against God. Ans. *Yes: A man by common grace may know that sin as sin is evil, and therefore may have uneffectual wishes to be freed from it as such: but at the same time he hath stronger apprehensions of the pleasure, profit or credit that it brings him, and this prevaileth. Indeed mens carnal interest which in sin they love, is not its opposition to God, nor the formal nature of sin. Doubtless all men that are ungodly do not therefore love sin, because it is sin, & against God, at lest this is not so total in them, but that there may be a subdued mind to the contrary, and dislike of sin as against God. Many a common drunkard I have known that when he hath heard or talkt of sin as sin, as against God, hath cryed out against himself, and wept as if he abhorred it: and yet gone on in it for the pleasure of the flesh.*

Object. But where then is mans natural enmity to God and Holiness? *Answ.* 1. *Its doubtfull whether man naturally hath an enmity to God and Holiness, considered simply: or only considered as being against mans carnal interest.* 2. *But were the former proved,*

ved, yet common Grace abateth that enmity, and gives men more then corrupted nature doth.

Object. But the experience of the godly telleth them that it is another kind of Light and Love which they have after conversion then before. *An.*1. *It is not all Converts that can judge by experience in this; because all have not had common grace in the highest, or any great observed measure before conversion.* 2. *Its hard for any to make that experiment, because we know not in our change just when common Grace left and special Grace began.* 3. *A Physical gradual difference may be as great as that which your experience tels you of. Have you experience of common light and love before conversion, and of another since which differeth from it, more then the greatest flame from a spark: and more then the sun-shine at noon from the twilight when you cannot know a man? Or more then the sight of the cured blind man, that saw clearly from that by which he saw men like trees,; or more then the pain of the strappado frrm the smallest prick of a pin.*

Objct. But it is not common gifts that are workt up to be special Grace; one *species* is not turned into another. *Answ. True: Imperfection is not turned materially into perfection. The dawning of the day is not materially turned into the greater light at noon. But a greater light supervenetb, and is added to the less. The blind mans seeing men like trees, was not it that was the perfect following sight, but an additional light was it.*

Objct. But special Grace is the divine Nature, the image of God, the new Creature, *&c.* and therefore doth differ more from common. *Answ. I easily yield the Antecedent, but deny the Consequence. The difference is as admirably great as these terms expres, though it be but a moral specifick difference.*

Reader, I will trouble thee no more, but to entreat thee, if thou be of another mind, to differ from me without breach of Charity, as I do from thee, and to remember that I obtrude not my explications on any, and if I have done thee wrong, it is but by telling thee my thoughts, which thou hast liberty to accept or reject as thou seest cause. But again, I intreat thee rather lay this by, or tear it out of the book, then it should be any stumbling block in thy way, or hinder thee from profiting by what thou readest. The Lord increase our Light and Life, and Love.

*Jan.*15. 1657.